NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

PhD
1928
b

Dwight M. Beck

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF the author

378.744
BO
PhD 1928
copy 1

July, 1929

Ideal
Double Reversible
Manuscript Cover.
PATENTED NOV. 15. 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster

28-6½

37545

The ~~Problem of the~~ Influence of Pauline Theology in the Gospel of Matthew.

by

Dwight Marion Beck

(A.B., Syracuse University, 1918.)
(S.T.B., Boston University, 1922.)

A Dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Graduate School

Boston University

1927 i.e. 1928

Bible. N.T. Matthew
Paul, Saint, apostle
Series

July 1929
37545

PhD
1928
b
copy 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction
1. The Problem: Pauline Influence in Matthew.....1
2. Materials and Method.....9

II. Historical Statement of Past Research
1. Origin of Problem.....10
2. Various Positions in regard to the Problem....13
A. There is anti-Paulinism in Matthew.....14
B. There is uncertainty about Paulinism in Matthew.....18
C. There is no Paulinism in Matthew.....21
D. There is Paulinism in Matthew.....23

III. The Synoptic Problem and Pauline Influence
1. Some accepted results of Synoptic Study.....29
2. Matthew's sources and purpose.....30
3. Antioch in relation to Matthew and to Paul....31

IV. Literary Parallels
1. Resch and Feine.....36
2. Von Soden.....38
3. Holtzmann.....40

V. Comparative Study of Pauline and Matthean Theology
1. Christology.....42
A. Earthly Life of Jesus.....42
B. Christ titles.....46
C. Son of David.....48
D. Son of Man.....51
E. Son of God.....58
F. Kurios.....67
G. Wisdom.....72
H. Death.....73
I. Resurrection.....75

2. Soteriology.....81
A.Jesus and Salvation.....81
B.Sin and Flesh.....85
C.Body and Spirit.....86
D.Righteousness.....89
E.Sacrifice and Forgiveness.....90
F.Faith.....93
3. The Mosaic Law.....98
4. The Gospel.....110
5. The Sacraments.....118
A.Baptism.....118
B.Lord's Supper.....126
6. The Kingdom of Heaven and Ecclesia.....133
A.Koinonia and Life.....140
7. Apostles and Disciples.....145
8. The Jews and Gentiles.....153
9. Use of the Old Testament.....162
10. Ethical Outlook.....171
A.Standards.....172
B.Motives.....175
11. Eschatology.....180
A.The Age -- Present and Future.....181
B.Signs of the End.....183
C.The Parousia.....188
D.The Resurrection.....190
E.The Judgment.....195
F.Final Kingdom or Consummation.....202

VI. Conclusions and Summary.....213

VII. Bibliography.....219

VIII. Autobiography.....240

THE INFLUENCE OF PAULINE THEOLOGY IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

I. INTRODUCTION

In an address at the opening exercises of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, October 5, 1926, Professor E. J. Goodspeed spoke on "The Challenge of New Testament Study." In the course of his address he said, "But of course the chief province of New Testament study is the New Testament itself. Here at first sight, everything seems to have been done. Yet it would be almost nearer the truth to say everything remains to be done. The several books of the New Testament have never been adequately examined in their literary and historical relations to one another..... To examine the New Testament in the light of the world's new knowledge must, in each new generation, be the work of New Testament scholarship and to evaluate afresh its unique worth to human life and to the human heart.... In an age so desperately eager for vulgarities old and new, real and imaginary, above the literary miasmas of the day the New Testament rises like some splendid mountain mass, serene and stupendous, even though rugged and difficult; towering above the mists and above the clouds, too, with promise of pure air, far vision and lofty fellowship in

its heights and depths. To point men to those heights and in research to explore those depths -- this is the challenge of the New Testament. The men and women who respond to it will have good companionship along the way; with scholars like Harnack and Loisy, Moffatt, Scott and Bacon; and fathers like Augustine, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Cyprian and Justin; and best of all a growing friendship with John, Matthew, Paul and Jesus."[1]

This passage confirms the significance of the problem undertaken in this dissertation some months previous to Goodspeed's declaration. The goal sought here is to <u>discover and evaluate any historical or theological relations between the writings of Paul and the gospel of Matthew.</u> Owing to the uncertainty of the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles,[2] the writings of Paul will be understood to exclude the Pastoral Epistles and to include the ten letters of Paul known as Galatians, First and Second Thessalonians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. The attempt will be made not to work by any one specialized branch of New Testament research but to

---

1. Jour. of Rel. VI: 6:567-9 (Nov.1926).
2. Cf. Harrison, Problem of Pastoral Ep., 5-17, 84f, 136; Lock, Pastoral Ep., XXIIf.

coordinate the results in the various fields in order to bring to bear on the problem, all that can be found and used. The literary-textual method is valuable but not sufficient for it often treats New Testament documents in a literary sense when they are fundamentally non-literary in character. Moreover the microscopic tests of philology, while counting conjunctions, may miss the vital meaning of the text. The religio-historical method, with considerable influence, has been sweeping the New Testament field. It is good from the standpoint of the comparative study of the history of religion. This method has helped because it sets the books of the New Testament in their proper historical context, with special emphasis on Christianity as a new, creative, religious movement which developed in relation to rival and competing movements in the contemporary religious life of the Graeco-Roman world. But Deissmann, coming from his Pauline studies with renewed interest in Christ-mysticism, believes that to "religionsgeschichtlich" must be added "kultgeschichtlich." Rawlinson thinks that the weakness of the writers in question is "that in their enthusiasm for the new point of view they have tended to overlook or to underestimate the significance of the fact that, if the earliest <u>readers</u> of the New Testament were in <u>almost</u> all cases Gentiles, its <u>writers</u> were in almost all cases (Luke, who had probably

been a "God-fearer", is an exception) originally Jews."[1] Intensive specialization is essential for advance and all branches, -- whether textual, literary, historical, source-analysis or psychology of mysticism, -- all must be available in comprehensive study.

That there is still work to be done two notable New Testament scholars have shown. "How to entangle in the teaching of this extraordinary man (Paul) the timeless element from the temporary; how to discriminate between his main intention and the by-products of his thought; how to discover within the circumstances of an ancient world the qualities which are fit for any world; how to detach the personality of Paul from the limitations of his environment and to interpret Paul in terms of the modern world, as Paul interpreted the Gospel in terms of Paulinism -- this is the problem, which is not to be met either by a reversion from Paul to the Gospels or by the subordination of the Gospels to Paul; and however imperfectly it may be solved, there is certainly no problem of biographical or of literary history which presents a more commanding challenge to the modern mind."[2] And Deissmann writes, "Daily gathering fresh enthusiasm for their holy objects scholars of every people and

---

1. N.T. Doctrine of Christ, X.
2. Peabody, The Apostle Paul and the Modern World, 38-9.

denomination push toward the same great goal which science has set before them -- the discovery of new truth. The fact that hundreds upon hundreds of new specialists, as generation follows generation, devote their best powers to the Old Book, yet never make an end of their investigations, proves the inexhaustibility of its contents. And the fact that even in the face of sharpest criticism it has victoriously asserted its life power may well give to those who would protect its sacredness by outward means, courage to leave the New Testament, with proud confidence yet longer in the brightest light of modern investigation." The present task "is to add to all philological and historical investigation, a truer and deeper spiritual appreciation of the vital forces of the New Testament."[1] Hence the aim here undertaken is not only to discover historical and theological relations of Paul and Matthew but also to render some estimate of their value in the world.

The question of Pauline influence in the gospels is a live issue. The editors of "The Beginnings of Christianity" voice a serious charge: "Much of the work on the gospels has been seriously injured by the effort both by conservative and radical writers, to explain

---

1. Review of the Churches, Jan. 1925, 199-200.

everything by the influence of St. Paul, and him in turn, largely by the use made of his epistles by later generations. Paul was a great leader but he was not the whole of Gentile Christianity, nor did he found every church."[1] This minimizing of Pauline influence is typical of some New Testament scholars who may be criticized for lack of appreciation of Paul and his great work. Burton points out that the Synoptics are the middle term with Paul preceding and the Fourth Gospel following, and he adds, "Influenced to some extent by the thought of Paul they undoubtedly are."[2] In the case of the Fourth Gospel a consensus of opinion leans to the recognition of the author as indebted to Paul and developing his ideas. But most divergent opinions center on the other gospels. The most recent outstanding example is to be found in the conflicting claims of Bacon[3] and Werner[4]. Both men have produced exhaustive works which manifest discriminating scholarship, yet both men are equally positive in directly opposing positions. Werner arrives at these sweeping conclusions:[5]

---

1. Foakes-Jackson & Lake, 1, 417. Cf. Holtzmann, (N.T. Theol. II,4) who thinks, on the contrary, that ideas of Paul are to be recognized in every New Testament Book.
2. Jesus and Paul, (Essay) Christianity in Modern World, 92.
3. The Gospel of Mark (1925).
4. Der Einfluss Paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium (1923).
5. Ibid, 209.

"Mag der Markus unseres zweiten Evangeliums mit dem Begleiter des Paulus zu identifizieren sein oder nicht, die Vergleichung seiner Schrift mit den heute weithin als echt anerkannten paulinischen Briefen zeigt folgendes:

1. Wo Markus mit Paulus übereinstimmt, handelt es sich immer um allgemeinurchristliche Anschauungen.

2. Wo inden Briefen über diese gemeinsame Basis hinaus besondere, characteristisch paulinische Anschauungen zutrage treten, da fehlen entweder bei Markus die Parallelen vollständig, oder Markus vertritt geradezu entgegengesetzte Standpunkte.

3. Von einem Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium kann daher nicht im geringsten die Rede sein."

And Bacon is equally emphatic:[1] "If it be asked 'Can we imagine a gospel such as Mark taking form in a community ignorant of the teaching of Paul?' the answer must be a decided 'No'. The whole aim of the Gospel, its Christology and soteriology, its discourses and the framework of their composition, especially what we are able to trace out of its relation to earlier sources, make it impossible to account for such a composition as this without the life, the thought, and the teaching of Paul. Mark shows a direct but not a literary dependence on the teach-

---

1. The Gospel of Mark, 271.

ing of the great apostle to the Gentiles."

In the case of Luke there has long been a debated question why Luke could be a companion of Paul and yet write his Gospel and Acts so independently. Of course this position assumes Lukan authorship of the Gospel and Acts.

There has never been a direct and detailed study of the relations of Pauline thought and the first Gospel. It has been referred to by scholars as later citations will show. This problem has not been attempted, perhaps, partly because of the assumed distance of the so-called Palestinian Gospel from Paul's Gentile world of work and writing, and partly because the major interest has been in sources of the gospel story. Once the influence or non-influence is established there, the question is partially settled for later works which used the sources. But the time is here for a careful study of Matthew and Paul. Regardless of influence or non-influence in Matthew's sources, the gospel itself is sufficiently later than the sources to merit a study in its own right as to possible relations to Paul or to parallel or contrasting developments from the well of primitive Christianity.

The method pursued in this dissertation is as follows: First, there is an historical investigation of the origin and rise of the problem, together with the statement of the different positions of New Testament scholars whose works contain a discussion of the problem or noteworthy references to it. Following this historical investigation is a brief statement of the Synoptic Problem in so far as it has bearing upon the work in hand. A statement of prominent literary parallels is then given. Next comes the main part of the dissertation. Here the Pauline Letters and Matthew provide the basis of factual material. Comparison, coordination and interpretation of the factual material are used to determine whether there is any relation between Matthew and Paul and to discover the value of the relation when found. The approach to the problem is largely from the historical and theological viewpoints with lesser reference to the literary aspects. This comparative study of Pauline and Matthean thought is centered upon the following decisive points: their Christology, Soteriology, attitude toward the Mosaic Law, the Gospel, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Apostles and Disciples, the Jews and Gentiles, the Use of the Old Testament, Ethical Outlook and Eschatology.[1]

---

1. These points for comparison were secured partly from a comparative study of various books dealing with New Testament Theology, especially the sections on Paul and Matthew, and partly from an empirical study of the writings of Paul and Matthew. They are intended to cover all the areas of thought which are essential in comparing Pauline and Matthean concepts.

II. HISTORICAL STATEMENT OF PAST RESEARCH

1. Origin of the Problem. The question of Pauline or anti-Pauline influence in the gospels may be traced back to Ferdinand Christian Baur, the founder of the famous Tübingen school of criticism. Baur applied Hegelian doctrines to Church history. The best expression of his position is found in his church history of the first three centuries.[1] Briefly stated his position follows. Matthew is "the most original and trustworthy source of the Evangelical history." "The gospel of Luke is colored by the Paulinism of its author and cannot be regarded as an impartial narrative."[2] Mark copied the other two Synoptics and hence cannot be regarded as an independent source. Matthew is a strongly Judaistic Petrine writing. In opposition to it stands the Gentile Pauline Lukan record. Mark is neutral. Acts provides a reconciliation of the two opposing gospels in which Peter and Paul speak in conciliating tones. Baur started a new and important movement in New Testament study. His hypothesis was a work of genius. But he may be criticized (1) for fitting not only the gospels but the entire New Testament into the rigid logical formula of thesis,

---

1. Das Urchristentum, Tübingen, Fues, 1853 (Tr. Menzies, 2 vol. Lond., Williams and Norgate, 1878-9). Cf. Paul, His Life and Works, (Intro.); Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, 571f.
2. Ibid, I,26.

antithesis and synthesis, (Early Christianity is greater than Nineteenth Century logic.) (2) for dating the gospels too late (3) for a mistaken chronological order (Mark is generally conceded as first now) (4) for overemphasizing the Judaism of Matthew.

Baur's successors have varied widely. Gustav Volkmar[1] is notable for placing Mark first chronologically and for insisting that "sein ganzes Werk ist eine Apologie des Heidenapostels."[2] Matthew is a combination of Luke and Mark with a universal, Jewish Christian attitude and is directed against an antichristian Rabbinism and a Pauline overthrowing of the Law.[3] Luke shows a modified Paulinism. The next outstanding development is found in Carl Holsten. In general he dates the gospels earlier than his predecessors. He posits an oral gospel in three forms[4], Pauline, Petrine and Judaistic or anti-Pauline. As long as the early oral period continued, both the gospel of Peter and Paul developed without serious difficulty because the early history shows both men working and preaching in the same common cause. But after their death the situation changed. A small Judaistic party grew in strength and opposition to the Gentile gospel of Paul.

---

1. Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien.
2. Ibid, 645.
3. Ibid, 653.
4. Die drei Ursprünglichen, noch ungeschriebenen Evangelien, 7f, 21f, 33f.

There was need for a gospel which would help the condition. So it came about "dass in diesem streite des judaistischen geistes mit dem petrinischen der jüdischen urgemeinde und dem paulinischen der heidnisch-jüdischen gemeinde, mit dieser sonderungseinigung in Jerusalem, welche die juden und jüdischen christen der heidenländer vom paulinischen evangelium ausschliessen sollte, mit dem endlichen siege des judaismus in antiochen über den Petrus und die sämmtlichen juden dieser paulinische gemeinde, für den judaismus das bedürfnis und der anstoss gegeben war, sein evangelium schriftlich festzustellen und namentlich die worte des Herrn, unter dem judaistischen principe gesammelt, sowol dem petrinischen, als vor allen dem paulischen evangelium als eine feste tatsache frei von der fliessenden unbestimmtheit der mündlichen überlieferung entgegenzustellen. Nur durch diese feste bestimmtheit der schrift konnte der petrinsche geist der gläubigen juden in dem palästinensischen gemeinden überwunden, der paulinische geist der gläubigen juden in den heidengemeinden besiegt werden."[1] But the Matthew gospel was not acceptable to many Gentile Christians so a little later (80 A.D.) Mark was composed from the Matthew material. And later still Luke was written as a united

---

1. Holsten, Die Synoptischen Evangelien, 174. (Capitals not used by Holsten.)

statement of both Matthew and Mark. Hilgenfeld[1] interestingly asserts that "der Ev. Matthäus hat nun aber einem Janukopf, dessen eines Gesicht in das Griechische, das andre in das Semitische weist." He assumes that anti-Paulinism is present and lists as examples which can be so interpreted the following passages: 13:12, 25:29, 21:11, 7:23, 11:12, 24:14, 5:18,19, 7:15-23, 7:6, 24:20, 16:18, 18:18. "Die Thatsache, wenn auch nicht der Umfang, eines solchen Verwandtschafts-verhältnisses ist ja schon längst bekannt und eines der wichtigsten Leitmotive für die tübinger Tendenzkritik geworden, deren ältere Schule aus der ganz auffälligen Verwandtschaft der Paulinischen Briefe mit dem Lukas-evangelium das Recht herleitete, dieses dritte kanonische Evangelium als ganz in der Tendenz des Paulinismus verfasst zu bezeichnen. In neuerer Zeit hat das Paulinische Element im Markusevangelium Volkmar und Holsten zu der Annahme fortgetrieben, dass das zweite Evangelium durch und durch als eine Paulinische Lehrschrift zu erklären und zu betrachten sei Aber das Paulinische Element ragt merkwürdigerweise auch in das erste kanonische Evangelium hinein, Theils in solchen Partien, die ihm allein angehoren, Theils in solchen Texten, die sich auch bei Markus und Lukas wiederfinden."[2]

---

1. Einl. in das N.T., 485.
2. Resch, Z.K.W., IX, (1888) 279.

2. In more recent times the Tübingen ideas have been carried forward by Pfleiderer. Mark is Pauline. Matthew is anti-Pauline. It is a gospel of heterogeneous elements.[1] It is both early and late, narrow and broad, conservative and reforming, legal and spiritual, Jewish and universal. It is a Jewish Christian ecclesiastical gospel harmony. It shows this fact by its baptismal formula, its doctrine of Christ, its doctrine of salvation, its justification of ethics, its authority ascribed to Peter, its beginning of penitential discipline, its warning against preaching for gain, its changing of the beatitude about the poor, and its cooling down of the eschatological spirit. It represents the "consciousness of a universal world church while in the making."[2] "In this gospel...the author urges his dissent from both the Pauline freedom of the Law and the narrow particularism of the Jews. (Cf.Mt.5:19; I Cor.15:9). The humblest part is here assigned to Paul in the kingdom of heaven, with an evident intentional allusion to his own personal confession, because both in practice and teaching he broke the small things of the Law."[3] First rank is absolutely refused him. Peter is first. Though Paul had a revelation of Christ (Gal.1:16)

---

1. Primitive Christianity, II, 373-395. Cf. also Carpenter, The First Three Gospels, 337f.
2. Christian Origins, 241.
3. Influence of the Apostle Paul upon Christianity, 144-5.

so had Peter and not of flesh and blood. (Mt.16:17) In the command, Depart, ye that work iniquity (lawlessness) (Mt. 7:21-23) "we hear...plainly the judgment of a legalistic Jewish Christian upon those Paulinists who call Jesus their Lord, are accustomed to speak of him in exalted language and perform miracles also in his name, but who will, notwithstanding all that, not be acknowledged by the Messiah as his followers, for the reason that they work lawlessness."[1] The gospel is not narrowly Jewish as shown by its incidents in which the woman of Canaan, Pilate's wife and the centurion play a part. But since the Gentile mission was known and must be dealt with, the commission is given to the Twelve, and the "all things" (28:20) indicate the validity of the whole Law. And in the marriage feast (22:11f.) the blessings of the Messianic kingdom are available for all men "only under the condition that they show themselves worthy of this honor by keeping the Law as a whole without excepting the small and external elements of it (vs.18,19). We see how far this universalism is still removed from that of the Apostle Paul."[2] The author of Matthew "agrees with Paul's principles though the theology of Paul is uncongenial to him. The mysticism of Paul's doctrines of salvation and grace with the exception of a few traces originating in Mark (Mt.20:28,26:28) was repressed."[3]

---

1. Ibid, 147-8.
2. Ibid, 150.
3. Christian Origins, 243.

Today, Bacon has appropriated many of the Tübingen ideas to which he has added his own contributions. His recent book on Mark exhibits many direct and indirect influences of Paulinism. His major work has been on Mark but he shows in "Jesus and Paul" that there is a distinct divergence between Pauline Christianity and Jewish Christianity and the synthesis takes place in the Fourth Gospel. Matthew is "constructed in the interest of a neo-legalistic type of Christianity."[1] The gospel shows opposition to Paulinism. Its Petrine supplements make Peter equal to Paul or above him in divine authority. Peter walks on the sea, he has an ordination to bind and loose, he pays the temple tax 'for me and thee' 'lest (14:29, 16:19, 17:27) there be cause to stumble'. On such a central message as faith there is divergence. "How could Paul on the one side find it in the symbolism of the two sacraments, forgiveness through the blood of Christ shed for our reconciliation, new life in the Spirit through baptism into his name; while Matthew on the other finds it in obedience to the enlarged commandment of a second Moses, soon to return to judgment as an apocalyptic Son of Man."[2]

Bacon's position is endorsed by Bosworth.[3] In a

---

1. Jesus and Paul, 177.
2. The Apostolic Message, 99.
3. Life and Teaching of Jesus, 318-9; Cf. also Fowler, History and Literature of the N.T., 278-9.

discussion of the wedding feast and guest with no garment the anti-Paulinism of Matthew is emphasized. "Then follows a paragraph probably due to the shaping influence of the early preachers in the Jewish Christian circles in which the Matthew gospel was produced. It is a hostile reference to the radical Jewish Christianity that seemed to conservative Jewish Christians to be flouting the Mosaic law. (Paul himself had occasion to protest against such. Rom. 6:15). This element has repeatedly appeared in the Matthew gospel: those Christian preachers who break and teach others to break commandments of the law (5:19); the prophets, successful exorcists and miracle workers all operating in Jesus' name but who do 'lawlessness' (7:21-23); sons of the evil one in the kingdom, close up against the righteous, causing 'stumbling' by doing 'lawlessness' (13:30,41); the 'bad' gathered with the good at the Messianic banquet in the present parable (22:10). Such persons are represented here by the man who appeared at the Messianic banquet without suitable dress. He had been wordy enough in the blatant controversial days, but finally he was reduced to speechlessness (vs.12). Perhaps there were some among the extremely conservative Jewish Christians who, when they read this paragraph thought they could identify the man alluded to! (Acts 21:20-22)"

"The Antinomian libertinism on which the evangelist repeatedly makes the sayings of Jesus to bear (7:22, 13:41, 24:11) in order to do battle with it as being something which seriously threatened the Christian life of his readers, can have made its appearance only in Gentile Christian circles where Paul's doctrine of freedom was misunderstood and abused; and this points us to the dispersion where we, according to the other writings of the New Testament, meet with this phenomenon."[1] In Streeter's recent influential book[2] a possible anti-Paulinism is granted. In discussing Mt.5:17-20 he states, "This reflects the attitude of the Jewish Christians (concerning the Law) who while barely tolerating the proceedings of Paul, regarded as the pattern Christian, James surnamed the Just, because his righteousness, even according to the Law, did exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees." Possibly Paul's passionate protest in I Cor.15:9f "has a reference to a description of him and his work by the Judaizers in words not dissimilar to those in the text (i.e.,Mt.5:12-20)."

3. Among the English scholars there seems to be considerable reluctance in granting any Pauline or

---

1. B. Weiss, The Life of Christ, I,68. Cf. also Schlatter, Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit, 243.
2. The Four Gospels, 257.

anti-Pauline influence in Matthew. Maurice Jones[1] takes pains to show that the gospels do not have such tendencies since he thinks they would be polluted by them. "I am well aware that the Synoptic Gospels themselves are alleged to be seriously infected by the influence of St. Paul." Foakes-Jackson is non-committal. "There is a difference of opinion as to whether the first two evangelists had felt the influence of Paul."[2] Headlam maintains, "It is possible some influence of St. Paul's teaching may have crept in but the most striking character of the Synoptic gospels...is complete absence of those features commonly described as Pauline." They represent the source and not the result of St. Paul's teaching." Loisy states that Matthew is "judeochrétien d'origine, il est universaliste d'esprit, sans aucune arrière-pensée de polemique en faveur de Paul ou contre les apôtres galiléens."[3] Moffatt thinks that the "so-called Paulinism of Mark does not amount to very much after all" and in the case of Matthew, the character of this gospel "with the Jewish Christian tinge of certain strata, naturally marks it off from Paulinism; as a matter of fact, it is anti-Pauline tendency

---

1. N.T. in the Twentieth Century, 58.
2. Life of St. Paul, 251.
3. Les Évangiles Synoptiques, I,143.

which is usually discovered in this gospel by those who bring it into any relation to the Apostle."[1] Further on he adds, "Both of the main sources which underlie the synoptic gospels attest a primitive belief in Jesus as the Christ; they presuppose a confession of faith which reaches back prior to Paul, and the essential characteristics of their Christology point to their independence of the contemporary Pauline theology,"[2] "The Jesus of the primitive church was a Jesus whom believers hailed and worshipped as the Christ of God. My point is that an examination of the earliest records, of the sources behind Mark and the other two synoptic gospels, shows that the Messianic drapery or setting of His person was <u>not</u> the <u>result</u> of <u>Paulinism</u> impinging upon the pure and original memory of a humanitarian figure, who lived and died for the sake of a message which amounted to little more than a doctrine of theism plus brotherly love."[3] This is his conclusion about the Jesus and Paul controversy which raged furiously twenty years ago. It does not deal with the present form of Matthew and Paulinism. "The influence of St. Paul on the thought and writing of the other New Testament writers is not easy to determine."[4] "The writer of the First Gospel does

---

1. Theology of the Gospels, 23.
2. Ibid, 26.
3. Ibid, 174.
4. Nollath, Rise of the Christian Religion, 544.

not appear to owe anything to St. Paul. His interest is almost entirely absorbed by the needs of the Jews. He is concerned to show that our Lord is the fulfillment of prophecy." "No doubt Paul himself loved to trace the connection between the Old Testament prophecy and its fulfillment in the person of our Lord. But his tone and style of reference are entirely distinct from the intensely Jewish manner in which the writer of the first gospel deals with prophecy."[1] "Matthew, James and the Apocalypse would seem to be the only writings really independent of his (Paul's) influence and even here it would be easy to find many Pauline touches."[2]

4. There are scholars who are outspoken in their opposition to finding any anti-Paulinism in Matthew. Jülicher claims that there is nothing more mistaken than to regard Matthew as anti-Pauline. There are "no specifically Pauline formulae in Matthew."[3] Moffatt becomes definite in a later work, "He (Mt.) does not show any anti-Pauline tendency; it is forced exegesis to detect a polemic against Paul."[4] J. Weiss in his last great work warns against exaggerating the influence of Paul. The history of primitive

---

1. Ibid, 546
2. Cohu, St. Paul, 24-5.
3. Intro. to the N.T., 311,314; Cf. Feine, Einl. in das N.T., 47, has the same statement but admits there may be Pauline words. Barth's Einl. in das N.T., 175-6, agrees with Moffatt.
4. Intro. to the N.T., 255-6.

Christianity is mostly written as the history of Paul, but there was a pre-Pauline period and the significance of this early community for the historical understanding of Christianity is not valued highly enough. Instead of looking for polemic or apology for the Apostle it is better to see that he found much at hand. "Vor allem aber unterschätzen wir die Tatsache, dass doch wesentliche Grundlagen des allgemeinen Christentums, der Messias-glaube, der Herren-mahl, die Überlieferung der Worte Jesu und die Kunde vom Leben Jesu, eine Fülle von Christlichen Begriffsprägungen und die Umprägung oder Übernahme jüdischer und alttestamentlicher Gesinnung und Vorstellungsweise durch die Urgemeinde geschaffen und auch von Paulus schon bis zu einem gewissen Grade fertig vorgefunden sind."[1] "Immerhin können wir schon heute erkennen, dass auch die Urgemeinde zum Bau des Paulinismus wichtige Fundament-Steine beigesteuert hat; Z.B. in der Christologie und Eschatologie, in der Ethik und in der religiösen Gesamt-Anschauung und Grundstimmung."[2] "The writer of this gospel rises far above the limitations of his own Jewish Christianity; to see anything in it directed against the teaching of St. Paul is strangely to misunderstand it. So far as there is anything polemical in Matthew it is directed not against the apostle of the Gentiles but against

---

1. Das Urchristentum, 2.
2. Ibid, 3.

Pharisaic Judaism."[1] Since Matthew exhibits evidences of a late date, it represents a later stage of thinking or at least the furthest outpost of Paul's thinking and may be called ultra-Pauline. Pauline problems lie in the past.[2] Keim is positive that the "malicious sarcasms said to be directed against Paul are mere fables."[3] Machen[4] admits that there has been the charge of Pauline influence "brought not only against John but also against the earlier gospels." "In the supposed passages in the synoptic gospels the writers are quite unaware that one conception is being replaced by another. This remarkable absence of a struggle between the Pauline conception and the primitive conception can be explained only if the two were essentially the same." In a private conversation, James Hardy Ropes stated that he regarded the assertion of Pauline influence as far from proved.

5. But there remain some witnesses who stand for Pauline influence in Matthew. They belong mostly to the radical group or to those who date the gospel very late. Drews finds Pauline influence in all the gospels, the strongest in Mark and Luke, but Matthew, which might have been written by a converted Jewish rabbi, occupies a middle ground. "Es

---

1. Plummer, St. Matthew, XI; Cf. McGiffert, Apostolic Age,575.
2. Burton and Willoughby, Short Intro. to the Gospels, 102-4.
3. Keim, Jesus of Nazara, I, 74.
4. (Art.) Jesus and Paul--Bib. and Theol. Studies, 567-8.

sind Versuche zwischen der allzu freien Ansicht des Paulus und derjenigen des gewöhnlichen Jüdentums zu vermitteln, das Judentum durch Berufung auf d. h. auf Gott selbst, von der Knechtschaft des Gesetzes zu befreien."[1] Piepenbring in his recently revised work[2] believes that the New Testament shows how rapidly many of Paul's views became current among the early Christians.....It is natural that we should find a similar point of view in our gospels all of which are of more recent date than the Pauline epistles. This can be most clearly seen in Matthew's gospel which contains more recent features than the other Synoptics. Influenced by Pauline doctrine, which assigns to the glorified Christ an actual kingdom in this world and especially within the fold of Christianity, his gospel put into the mouth of Jesus the following statements: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them (17:20); All authority hath been given me in heaven and earth. Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world, (28:18,20)." Klausner writes, "The discourse of Jesus, given at the end of Matthew is very late and replete with the Pauline spirit."[3] Von Soden believes that Matthew

---

1. Die Entstehung des Christentums, 314,316.
2. The Historical Jesus, 56-7.
3. Jesus of Nazareth, 358.

.....

marks the close of the primitive Christian development of gospel literature. "Even though it shows acquaintance with Pauline epistles, it no longer knows St. Paul. His spirit is alien to it though his language may be employed here and there. It points onward to the development towards Catholicism, hence it became the chief gospel, the work which took the lead in guiding this development and in so far no book ever written is of greater historical importance....In this gospel the Roman spirit triumphs over the Pauline."[1] Wrede's striking thesis that Paul was a second founder of Christianity, who was stronger but not better, holds that except for the earliest stratum of material, the synoptic gospels came into existence alongside and after the elaboration of Paul's gospel and hence--here and there--are under its influence.[2] In Meyer's monumental work he holds that Matthew must be approached in the light of the Pauline standpoint.[3] Renan[4] sees that it is "le feu sombre qui anime les instructions apostoliques (in Mt.) nous paraît en partie un reflet des ardeurs fiévreuses de Paul." He thinks the editor of the book has favored Paulinism. "Il efface, en particular, dans le récit

---

1. History of the Early Christian Literature, 198-200.
2. Paul, 155.
3. Ursprung und Aufänge des Christentums, III, 605.
4. Les Évangiles, 206,207,210.

des apparitions des Jésus ressusité le rôle de Jacques, que les disciples de Paul tenaient pour au ennemi déclaré.. Par moments, il (Mt.) est parlé de la foi comme dans les épîtres de saint Paul.(8:10,13; 9:2,22; 15:28.") In the passages Renan selected Jesus commends the faith of the leper, the paralytic and the blind men and rebukes the disciples for little faith. Davidson finds Matthew with varied characteristics owing to successive revisers, and the last one, a Paulinist, "interwove liberal among Ebionite statements, so that Pauline mingling with Petrine elements have modified the original Ebionism."[1] "The Gentile or Pauline part is often made to subserve the general purpose of showing that Jesus is the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament and that the main incidents of his life are foreshadowed there."[2] The "noun 'church' is transferred from Paulinism to Petrinism."[3]

From the foregoing historical account it may be seen that varying opinions are prevalent. In general the investigators may be grouped thus: (1) Those who hold that Matthew is strongly anti-Pauline. (2) Those who are in a tentative frame of mind. (3) Those who will grant no anti-Paulinism. (4) Those who see Pauline influence. McNeile's

---

1. Intro. to the N.T., I, 367.
2. Ibid, 361.
3. Ibid, 369.

middle ground judgment sums up the situation. "It is probable that every book in the New Testament that is not from the apostle's pen appeared, in its present form, after his death, though much of the materials of the gospels was no doubt being shaped and collected during his lifetime; and his influence on the writers is frequently strong and marked. But they were influenced by him in very unequal degrees; and some of them present earlier elements which are, for the most part clearly discernible."[1] But "the relation of St. Paul's epistles to these documents (gospels) will always remain of primary interest and importance."[2] "It is true that the theology of the early church embraced a variety of types which cannot be reduced to Jewish and Gentile Christianity respectively, much less to the influence of the great apostle; but he was the first theologian of the church, his letters present a fairly clear outline of his views and <u>his influence</u> therefore has to be taken primarily into account as a factor in the evolution of the religious conceptions which the four gospels voice, in so far as these cannot be traced back with certainty to the teaching of Jesus himself."[3] Shortly after the opening of this century there arose a great tide of discussion concerning the re-

---

1. N.T. Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, XIII.
2. Knowling, Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, 200.
3. Moffatt, Theology of the Gospels, 21.

lations of Jesus and Paul. Much of the debate raged over the question of Paul's representation of Christianity. Was he a founder of a different religion about Jesus or one who developed but held true the essentials of the religion of Jesus? Much search was devoted to finding the evidences of the gospel record and influence in Paul's writings. "In der Erörterung des problems Paulus und Jesus ist eine gewisse Stille und Ruhe eingetreten. Von einer Erledigung der Frage kenn man kaum reden."[1] But in recent years another tendency is discernible, especially in the newer books. While it is recognized that the relation of the theology of Paul and the gospels is one of interaction yet "it is the effect of Paulinism upon the gospels, not vice versa, which has to be considered."[2] And in the light of the generally accepted datings of the gospels which place them later than Paul's letters, it appears that Moffatt's statement is important.

---

1. Heitmüller, Z.N.T.W., XIII (1912), 320.
2. Moffatt, op.cit., 19.

III THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM AND PAULINISM

A brief statement of the Synoptic problem and its answers which bear upon the Pauline influences in Matthew must here be undertaken. Some scholars of the past have built up a dating of the gospels and dependency, one on the other, which are not generally followed today. Their Pauline hypotheses depended partly upon their gospel arrangements. There are some results of Synoptic study which have found wide acceptance, viz. (1) the priority of Mark, (2) its use by the other two Synoptics (3) Q (Quelle=Source) a once-existing written document used by Matthew and Luke. This familiar Two-Document theory still has its strident challengers.[1] And a Liberal like Lake thinks it is well to remember that "Q after all is a name, not of an existing document but of a critical judgment that there is a documentary source behind the material common to Matthew and Luke but absent from Mark."[2] Moreover "the result of this concentration of attention on the value of synoptic criticism for the life of Jesus and of the neglect of the editorial subjectivity of the evangelists has been a general tendency to overlook the value of the gospels as the record of the opinion of the generation which produced them."[3]

---

1. Lummis, The Case against "Q", Hib.Jour.XXIV,4,July,1926,755-765; Jameson, Origin of the Synoptic Gospels; Lockton, Origin of Gospels, Church Quart. Rev.XCIV, 188,216-239.
2. Landmarks in the History of the Early Church, 37.
3. Ibid, 38.

Because Matthew used some sources, written and oral, his work is not a mere compilation. "It is essential, at the outset, to feel the massive unity of this book, if any justice is to be done to it either from the literary or from the religious standpoint."[1] "The individuality of the author makes itself so strongly felt from the beginning to end in both style and tendency, in cadence and thought, that it is impossible to think of the gospel as a mere compilation."[2] It may also be said that the average Christian in the churches never discovers the dependence of Matthew upon Mark until some critic points it out. While not agreeing with radical "tendenz" theories it may be maintained that the author is dominated by an apologetic purpose. "The writer's purpose is not so much to produce a set biography as to illustrate certain aspects of his theme from the life and teaching of Jesus the Messiah. The writer's aim is to show that Jesus the true Messiah foreshadowed in Old Testament prophecy, while recognizing as divine the Jewish law, 'fulfilled' it by coming to found a Kingdom, which, transcending Jewish limitations, is of universal character and scope."[3] The author faced certain actual conditions and his method had to be adapted to meet them. His book represents a definite standpoint. He handled

---

1. Moffatt, Intro. to N.T., 245, Cf. Renan's artistic treatment, Les Evangiles, 212f.
2. Jülicher, Einl. in das N.T., 315.
3. Box, St. Matthew, 4-5

his theme and his materials so skillfully that his gospel became the gospel in the early church. His theology, his ethics, his literary method, his general character are distinct and for that reason can be compared with the other great writer (Paul) a few years before him. Because the writer of Matthew has done so well not a few have found it possible to agree with Renan's remarkable claim, "Cela était plus important que l'exactitude biographique, et l'Évangile de Matthieu, tout bien pesé, est le livre le plus important du Christianisme, le livre le plus important qui ait jamais été écrit."[1]

There is no general agreement among scholars as to the place of origin or date. There is general unity in the fact that it was written for Jewish Christian readers. Its date varies from 50 to 150 A.D. but for the present purposes it may be assumed that a date not far from the fall of Jerusalem (22:7) is most compatible with the internal data. The author, it is commonly agreed, was not the disciple Matthew though the disciple's name probably was connected with a work which the later editor used.[2] The place of origin, if it can be determined, has more bearing on the problem under consideration and hence must be investigated, though the field lies outside the scope

---

1. Les Évangiles, 212.
2. Eusebius, H.E., III,39.

of this dissertation. There are two main fields where Matthew may have been written: Palestine or Syria.[1] The traditional view has favored Palestine. It was based on Irenaeus'[2] statement that Matthew published his written gospel among the Hebrews in their own language while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the church at Rome. But the canonical Matthew was written originally in Greek and hence is not the one to which Irenaeus referred. There is a decided swing at the present time to a Syrian origin with the city of Antioch as the most probable place. In that case, its relation to Paul who was often at Antioch (cf. Acts, 11:26; 13:1; Gal.2:11) becomes of great interest. Loisy[3], Feine,[4] Renan,[5] J. Weiss,[6] Streeter,[7] Box[8] and Kidd[9] are among those who favor Syria or Antioch. Streeter sums up the reasons for the selection. (The arrangement and wording are mine.) (1) Each of the gospels has behind it a great church; Antioch sponsored Matthew. (2) No Palestinian church is probable for the material peculiar to Matthew is Haggadic rather than historical. (3) There are no objections to Antioch, (4) Antioch best explains many of the features of

---

1. Barth, Einl.N.T.,176 favors Asia Minor; Holdsworth,Gospel Origins, 73, Alexandria; Meyer, Ursprung,I,604. Asia Minor.
2. Adv. Haer, III,11.
3. Les Évangiles Synoptiques,I,143.
4. Einl.N.T., 47.
5. Les Évangiles, 214. (One of the first to select Syria.)
6. Das Urchristentum, 584.
7. The Four Gospels, 500f.
8. Z.N.T.W., 1905, 83 (Note)
9. History of the Church, I,23.

Matthew. (5) Jerusalem had been destroyed and the refugees had fled; some came to Antioch. Their traditions were sure to be put into Greek but in a different atmosphere. This explains many of the puzzling contradictory features. (6) Antioch had an enormous Jewish population. "The inhabitants of the city were mostly either of Syrian or Jewish extraction but of Greek habits and language."[1] This provides for a Greek gospel for Jewish Christians where there was a strong church. (7) Ignatius, bishop of Antioch c.115, has several clear quotations from Matthew, so also the Didache which is an early Syrian document. Both speak of 'the gospel', as if it were the name of a book having authority. (8) The "stater" (Mt. 17:24-27) varied in weight and value in different districts. Only in Antioch and Damascus did it equal exactly two didrachmae as is implied in Matthew's account. (9) Matthew is notable for its enhancement of apocalyptic. When the Parousia was expected with such intensity, Antioch, eastern gate of the Roman Empire, was the first to hear of the false Neros who arose successively across the Euphrates and hence Apocalyptic fears were constantly stirred. (10) Antioch was responsible for Rome's acceptance of Matthew as an apostolic document. Some of these reasons are only conjectures but taken together they

---

1. Aytoun, City Centers of Early Christianity, 82.

make a strong line for the Antiochene origin of Matthew. In this same region Paul spent a decade or more of unknown years (Gal. 2:21f). His teachings and work were well known in Antioch. His letters date from a period after he left this region but he frequently returned. If his letters are dated from 48-68 then it is clear that Matthew which falls within twenty years later may have some relations with Paul. Our problem does not relate to source analysis and the letters of Paul and Matthew must be studied as they stand and have stood in the church. Our next step is to compare and evaluate the documents. McNeile in a pioneering study,[1] is the only writer who has dealt in a comprehensive way with the problem of this dissertation. His work is much more general than is here undertaken. He makes no detailed study of the separate gospels. Since his work deals with the entire New Testament his discussion of Paulinism in the gospels is merely summary. But he suggests the value of comparative study. He believes that "to study St. Paul's teaching by itself is to study only a section, though a large and important section of New Testament Christianity. The other writings,

---

1. N.T. Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's. He compares the Synoptic teaching as a whole, with Paul's on the basis of the following points: Sonship, Eschatalogy, The Son, The Messiah, Spirit and Wisdom, Kenosis, the human Jesus and the glorified Christ of St. Paul.

while they include, on the one hand, additions that were made in the development of Pauline doctrine, include also, on the other hand, that of which the Pauline doctrine was itself a development, and without reference to which the full value of his work cannot be measured."[1]

---

1. Ibid, XIII.

IV. LITERARY PARALLELS

The proof or disproof of Paul's influence in Matthew does not lie in citations from the former in the latter. New Testament writers did not regard their fellow-authors as subjects for Scriptural quotations, because they did not know them or did not regard them as equal to the Scriptures known in the Old Testament.[1] Quotations from the New Testament do not appear much until Irenaeus. However there have been notable works of comparison from which some facts about literary parallels may be drawn. One early work was by Resch in 1904.[2] His lists are much too long and detailed to be reproduced in full. His work is based upon parallel passages and arrangements of words common to Matthew and Paul and yields a surprising number of similarities. His book, however, is vitiated by the indiscriminate use of unsifted material and by uncritical assumptions, and by the fact that the assumed parallels are often mere repetitions of the same words.[3] Such a method could be used to compare any two books in the same language but it would not constitute valid proof of influence. However, his work is a surprising production of scholarly patience.

---

1. The only exception is II Peter 3:16 which is very late.
2. Der Paulinismus und die Logia, 468-493.
3. Zahn, (Intro. to Gospels, II, 383) refers to the "fancies of Resch" as not worthy of belief.

Feine[1] performs a similar work, too exhaustive to be given here. A count of their Matthean parallels in the Pauline epistles is summed up in the table given below.

	Resch	Feine
1 Thess.	45	32
2 Thess.	21	10
Gal.	57	19
1. Cor.	153	85
2 Cor.	72	26
Rom.	181	71
Col.	64	30
Eph.	93	35
Philemon	3	0
Phil.	46	14
	735	322

These parallels are astonishing in number but there are others who have counted and have been more conservative. Morgan[2] provides "a list of parallel passages in which the hypothesis of dependence of Paul on the gospels is at least arguable." His list was compiled for the opposite theory of dependence from the one here worked upon but he provides a weapon which can cut both ways.

	Rom.	2:1	=	Mt.	7:1
	"	2:6	=	"	16:27
	"	2:7	=	"	15:14, 23:16
	"	9:33	=	"	21:42
	"	12:14	=	"	5:44
	"	13:7	=	"	21:25
Gal. 5:14	"	13:8-10	=	"	22:34f
I Cor. 8:7-13	"	14:13	=	"	18:6-9
	"	16:9	=	"	10:16

1. Jesus Christus und Paulus, 305-309.
2. Religion and Theology of Paul, 34-5

I Cor.	1:27	=	Mt. 11:25, 16:15
"	6:2	=	" 19:28
"	6:17	=	" 19:5
"	13:2	=	" 21:21
Phil.	3:10	=	" 16:24
Col.	3:5	=	" 6:24
2 Thess.	3:3	=	" 6:13

Such a formidable list argues at least a common circle of thought if not influence.

Von Soden[1] finds a striking list of terminological relationships and considers it doubly striking because the Matthean theology, unlike Luke, has no resemblances to Paul. It may be questioned whether Von Soden is correct in holding there is not the slightest feeling for Pauline ideas. The following list is abbreviated from Von Soden.

Mt.

23:27	ἀκαθαρσία	= Paul, 7 times besides Eph. 4:19,5:3. (See p.39.)
10:16	ἀκέραιος	= only in Rom.16:19 Phil.2:15.
28:14	ἀμέριμος	= only in I Cor. 7:32
13:14	ἀναπληροῦν	= only in I Thess.4:17.
25:1,6	εἰς ἀπάντησιν	= only in I Thess.4:17.
5:7	ἔλεεῖν	= frequent in Paul
10:26	κεκαλυμμένον	= 2 Cor. 4:3.
6:12	ὀφείλημα	= only in Rom. 4:4
5:20,13:12,25:29	περισσεύειν (not literal)	= only in Paul.
6:24	ἀγαπᾶν τὸν ἕτερον	= Rom. 13:8
27:52	οἱ ἅγιοι	= Gal.1:16 I Cor.15:50 Eph.6:12.
16:17	σάρξ καὶ αἷμα	= Gal.1:16 I Cor.15:50 Eph.6:12.
27:24, 27:4,6,8	αἷμα (of Christ)	= frequent in Paul
23:25	ἀκρασία	= only in I Cor. 7:5.
7:13	ἀπώλεια	= Pauline usage.

1. Theologische Abhandlungen, 156-165.

Mt.

28:19	βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα	= like Paul.
20:21	βασιλεία Χριστοῦ	= like Paul.
1:19	δειγματίζειν	= only in Col.2:15
11:1	διατάσσειν	= only in I Cor.9:14. In both cases of a rule for missionaries.
6:33	δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ	= like Paul.
5:47,6:7,18:17	ἐθνικοί	= only in Gal.2:14, B John 7.
17:26	ἐλευθερος of the freedom of the Sons of God.	= like Paul
16:18	ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ	= Rom. 16:16
11:27, 7:16,20		= exactly in Pauline sense.
7:23	ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνομία	= like Paul
11:29	ζυγός	= Gal. 5:1.
16:16,26:63	θεὸς ζῶν	= Paul.
25:34	κληρονομεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ	= only in Paul.
7:21	θεμελιοῦν	= Col. 1:23
18:15	κερδαίνειν	= I Cor. 9:19-22.
20:16,22:14	κλητοί	= like Paul
27:52	κεκοιμένοι	= I Thess.4:13; I Cor.15:20.
23:28	μεστοί ἐστε	= Rom.1:29.
15:14,23:16,24	ὁδηγὸς τυφλῶν	= Rom.2:19.
16:18	οἰκοδομεῖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν	= I Cor. Eph.
25:26	ὀκνηρός	= only Rom.12:11, Phil.3:1.
24:3,27,37,39	παρουσία	= II Thess.
6:14	παραπτώματα	= Eph.
4:3	ὀπειράζων	= only I Thess.3:5
5:5	πραύς	= Paul.
11:29,21:5	πραύς (of Christ)	= only II Cor.10:1
6:13,27:43	ῥύεσθαι	= like Paul
24:31	σάλπιγξ	= I Thess.4:16. I Cor.15:52
18:20	συνάγεσθαι	= I Cor.5:4
5:48, 19:21		= Eph.
17:25	τέλος	= Rom.13:7
12:32	αἰὼν μέλλων	= Eph.1:21
11:29	ἡ ψυχή in sense of life	= 2 Cor.12:15, I Thess.2:8
5:14	φῶς of Christians	= only in Eph.5:8
15:11,17	ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος	= Eph.4:29.
23:27	ἀκαθαρσία	= Eph.4:19, 5:3 (See p.38).

Holtzmann,[1] gives the following parallels which show relationship between Paul and Matthew.

---

1. N.T. Theol. II, 232-233.

Mt.

11:25-27	= I Cor. 1:19-21
20:28	= I Cor. 9:14, 10:27
5:32, 19:9	= I Cor. 7:10-11.
7:12	= Rom.13:8-10, Gal.5:14.
22:21	= Rom. 13:6-7
5:44	= I Cor. 4:12, Rom. 12:14
17:20, 21:21	= I Cor. 13:2.
7:2	= Rom. 2:1, 14:4.
21:42	= Rom. 9:33.
12:36	= Rom. 14:12.
24:30-31	= I Thess. 4:16-17.
24:36,43	= I Thess. 5:2.
26:61	= I Cor.3:9,16,17, 6:19, 2 Cor. 6:16
5:37	= 2 Cor. 1:17
20:26-27	= Gal. 6:2
5:13	= Col.4:6, Rom.12:18, 2 Cor.13:11, I Thess.5:13.
5:39-40	= I Cor. 6:7

These lists of literary parallels show that there is relationship between Paul and Matthew though the best evidence for relationship is in ideas rather than citations. The conclusions from a literary comparison are well stated by Resch: "Diese Thatsachen aber und die weiteren von mir beigebrachten Beispiele, welche sind such noch durch viele andere Belege vermehren liessen, reichen hin, um schon jetzt folgende Schlussfolgerung zu begründen: (1) Eine schriftstellerische Verwandtschaft zwischen den Paulinischen Briefen und dem ersten kanonischen Evangelium ist unleugbar. (2) Diese Verwandtschaft kann aber nicht als das Verhältniss der Abhängigkeit des einen Schriftstellers von dem anderen erklärt und betrachtet werden. (3) Es ist vielmehr das Verhältniss der gemeinsamen Abhängigkeit von einer vorkanonischen Evangelienschrift, aus welcher der erste Evangelist und vor ihm schon Paulus schöpften. (4) Und zwar war es eine ursprünglich hebräisch geschriebene Quellenschrift, deren verschiedene Uebersetzungstypen man im Griechischen

wahrnehmen kann."[1]

---

1. Resch, ZKW., IX (1888), 288.

V COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PAULINE AND MATTHEAN THEOLOGY.

1. CHRISTOLOGY.

The centrality of Christology for all New Testament writers is well known to all students of these writings. Pfleiderer rightly states that "Paul's Christology comprehends the fundamental ideas of his gospel" and that his Christology is not from tradition, nor abstract speculation or extraneous philosophical dicta "but is derived from reflections on blessings of salvation granted in the death and resurrection of Christ as these present themselves to the faith of Paul as facts of his inward experience."[1] It is sufficient to say at the outset, that there is no systematic statement of Christology in either Matthew or Paul. "Paul's writings do not constitute a philosophic system, because they are not purposefully hammered out, but fused by an intense heat from within. His basis is not only certain principles worked out to their logical results, but also experiences like flashes of lightning which lit up the cave of consciousness and melted its contents into new and sometimes irregular forces."[2]

JESUS' EARTHLY LIFE The earthly life of Jesus is a natural starting point for comparison. The constant occurrence of the name Jesus in Paul's writing effectually

---

1. Paulinism, 27.
2. Gardner, Historic View of the N.T., 217.

disposes of the suggestion that Paul knew nothing or cared nothing about the historic Jesus. It is true that Paul did not lay much stress on Jesus' earthly life but he thinks of him as 'born of a woman', 'under the Law', a member of the Jewish race sharing its privileges and responsibilities. (Gal. 4:4). He was born of the lineage of David and as a descendant of the royal house he was qualified for Messiahship. (Rom.1:3) He came to be in the likeness of a man (Phil. 2:7-8) and was found in fashion as a man. (Rom. 8:3, Rom. 9:5; II Cor. 5:21, I Cor. 11:1; Gal. 2:20) He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3) and he took the form of a servant (Phil.2:7). All these point to a complete identification with humanity. J. Weiss[1] is inclined to think that from 2 Cor.5:16 Paul had actually seen Jesus in the flesh. "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, κατὰ σάρκα yet now we know him so no more" probably refers not to historical knowledge, though possible, but rather to knowing Christ by a fleshly kind of knowledge whereas now he was in Christ and had knowledge according to the Spirit. (Rom.8:4) The death of Jesus, as a man, (Gal.3:13) is everywhere apparent in Paul's letters. He makes no attempt to define or explain the humanity of Jesus. He simply assumes it as a fact and writes and works on that assumption.[2] It is apparent

---

1. Das Urchristentum, 137; Feine, Theol. des N.T., 259, takes the opposite view, and is probably correct.
2. Matheson (Art.) The Expositor, 2 ser. I, 46-63, II, 27-47. Lumby (Art.) The Expository Times, I, 5 and 6.

that he held to the sinlessness of Jesus. He 'knew no sin' (2 Cor.5:21, Rom.6 :3, Phil. 2:8).[1] It may be granted that Paul gives few historical facts but his purpose was not to write a history and he may have assumed that the Christians to whom he wrote had the facts of the gospel. Deissmann warns against using the argument from silence in Paul who appreciated Jesus' character as a whole more than its details.[2] Scott holds that he knew far more than he stated, although his facts can be given in a single sentence.[3] The facts which Paul gives are reliable. "So haben wir vollen Grund, den Angaben des Apostels über den geschichtlichen Jesus volles Vertrauen in Absicht auf ihre Geschichtlichkeit zu schenken."[4] "On the whole, there was abundant opportunity for Paul to learn from the early community of Jesus' earthly life, as well as the interpretation they put upon his person and work."[5]

---

1. Of many discussions see Garvie, Studies of Paul and his Gospel, 127; Beyschlag, N.T. Theology, II,70; Stevens, Pauline Theology, 209.
2. Paul, 195-6.
3. Camb. Bib. Essays, 336. (omitting Scrip.ref.) "Jesus is known to Paul as a man, born of a woman, descendant of Abraham, of the family of David, and a minister of circumcision, as a brother of James and other leaders of the church, as wholly obedient to God, an adequate subject for imitation by men, as loving men, as gentle, as pleasing not himself; and of course as having suffered death upon the cross, after having been betrayed on the same night as he partook of the last supper; and finally as many passages testify, as having been raised from the dead by the will and power of God."
4. Schmoller, S.T.K., LXVII, 705.
5. Case, A.J.T., XI., 2,286.

But Paul's gospel may have been regarded as one sided in its lack of historical emphasis.[1] Certainly the canonical gospel took form while there were notable Christian leaders who were gaining converts and instructing in the principles of Christian living. Matthew's gospel was doubtless written to meet needs in the early Christian community. It bears all the marks of communal character and is the best adapted, with its groupings and numerical arrangements, for catechetical purposes[2] as well as public reading. In stating the argument for Pauline influence, Scott (who is doubtful) holds that "in order that Pauline influences should be able to affect the evangelic material by additions and modifications, it is necessary to suppose that that material was at the time in a fairly fluid state, able still to respond to the molding influence of a later scheme of thought, also that effective contact was really established between the two."[3] But that the material was not determined may easily be seen in Matthew's use of Mark and even though some influences of the time when the gospel was written have crept in, they do not affect the value of the gospel. Matthew's historical arrangement need only be indicated here. He does not attempt a biography in the modern sense and a "true sequence cannot be traced."[4] He gives the genealogy and infancy, the

---

1. Allen, St. Matthew, 320.
2. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 218.
3. Jesus and Paul, Camb. Bib. Essays, 334.
4. McNeile, St.Matthew, XIII, Cf. Zahn, Intro.to N.T.,II,380-6.

preparation, the Galilean ministry, hostility, instructions, journey to Jerusalem and the events of the last week. He is like Paul in placing teaching rather than history in the forefront and like Paul he devotes much space to the death and sufferings and resurrection of Jesus. He differs notably from Paul in the additions of the Virgin Birth and accounts of miracles. There is no certainty of Paul's knowledge of the Virgin Birth. "Born of a woman" (Gal.4:4) is no more a reference to such a birth than "according to the flesh" (Rom.1:3) is against it. It may be guessed that apart from the fact that Matthew had sources for his story, that he felt the need and value of an account which mediated between Mark's brief history of a human life and the supernatural Messianic theories that Paul propounded for his converts. The Virgin Birth provided the middle step between the two. In regard to miracles, Paul had little in his letters, though he recognized healings and miracles as a gift of the Spirit (I Cor.12:9-10). But it may be affirmed with confidence that there are no certain evidences of relation between Paul and Matthew in accounts of Jesus' earthly life, even though Resch found, often fancifully, almost a thousand parallels in Jesus' teaching and Paul's.

CHRIST TITLES We turn to the use of titles. Matthew uses χριστός once (1:16) without an article. It appears frequently in Paul.[1] In Matthew it retains the

---

1. Jesus is given the name χριστός by Paul 382 times. Cf. Mathews, Mess. Hope in N.T., 190 (note).

appearance of a title. In Paul it becomes rather a proper name. Matthew uses ὁ χριστός in 1:17, 2:4, 11:2, 16:16,30, 22:42, 23:10, 26:63, 24:5. Paul also uses it very frequently. Here a common usage is reflected, probably derived from primitive circles. Matthew has Ἰησοῦς Χριστός only in 1:1 while Paul has it seventy times according to Feine.[1] There is no reversal of the position of the names in Matthew which is a specific Pauline usage.[2] In Matthew the use of this name, χριστός indicates that Jesus was the Davidic Messiah (1:17, 2:4); that he was so recognized by his disciples (16:16); that Jesus knew and used the term (22:42) and even applied it to himself (23:10); he warned against false Christs (24:23,24, 24:5); that he was tried before the high priest on the question of his claim to Messiahship. It is doubtful whether Jesus applied the term to himself as the Evangelist indicates in 23:10. "One is your Master, even the Christ" sounds more like a later teaching about Christ. It is close to the Pauline idea of one Lord, and his supremacy over all (Eph.4:4) though Paul does not use καθηγητής as does Matthew. Paul's usual titles are "the Christ," "Christ," "the Lord Jesus Christ" and "our Lord Jesus Christ." Burton indicates that the "Christos" usage has five meanings.[3] (1) Messiah

---

1. Feine, Jesus Christus und Paulus, 21,22 gives complete tables of Pauline titles for Christ; Burton, Galatians, 392-394, gives them for N.T.
2. Feine, op. cit., 35.
3. Burton, Galatians, 396f.

without personal identification; (2) as a subject of affirmation or question; (3) Messiah as identified with Jesus; (4) as title or name for Jesus with no emphasis on Messiahship; usually if the article is used the Messiah is meant, if omitted it is a title or name; (5) it is used with other titles of Jesus to form a compound appellative.[1] Paul does not raise the question of Jesus as the Messiah. It is taken for granted and is usually a title, meaning probably savior or deliverer from sin, one who secures divine approval and promises future glory. In Matthew the question of Messiah is raised and answered at Caesarea Philippi, but throughout the gospel, Jesus is assumed to be the Messiah and is given that name from the beginning (1:1). It appears that in the use of the term Christ there is a common Christian usage in both Paul and Matthew with both showing an exaltation of Jesus by the use of the word.

SON OF DAVID Matthew is notable among New Testament writers for his preference for υἱὸς Δαυείδ . Nine times he uses the exact expression and refers to David in several others. The title occurs six times elsewhere in the rest of the New Testament.[2] Paul does not use the exact words but he has the same idea in Rom. 1:3 "seed of David" and in Rom.15:12 he quotes Isa.11:10 "root of Jesse." The royalty of the Messiah, his assured Davidic ancestry, create one of the outstanding impressions concerning Jesus, as Matthew has described him.

---

1. Ibid, 399 (σωτήρ occurs but once in Paul (Phil. 3:20). Pastorals omitted.)
2. Plummer, St. Matthew, 289.

Matthew adds "touches of purple and gold." In studying these passages, 1:20 may be omitted. There the title is applied to Joseph by the angel. In 1:1 the first claim of Davidic sonship appears in the genealogy. In 9:27 the two blind men apply it to Jesus. In 12:23 the multitude questions whether Jesus is the Son of David after the dumb man has been healed. In 15:22 the Canaanitish woman recognizes Jesus by the title. In 20:30,31 the two blind men of Jericho repeat the title twice. In 21:9 it is upon the lips of the admirers in the Triumphal Entry. In 22:43 in answer to Jesus' question the Pharisees say that the Messiah is the son of David. It is uncertain how widely spread among the Jewish people was the transcendent Messiah belief. It is probable that there was no united opinion about the Messiah as the Son of David. The ancient glories of the Davidic dynasty were recalled by the name, and this Messiah was not to appear by human birth and life but in the clouds of the sky.[2] The title repeated by the common people does not offer much explanation, except to show that in Matthew's view the Messianic character of Jesus was recognized throughout the course of his ministry. The discussion with the Pharisees 22:43 is more revealing. Here

---

1. McNeile, St. Matthew, XVII.
2. Cf. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 2, "Die erstere, messianische Vorstellung fasst sich etwa in dem Titel der Sohn Davids." Bousset thinks the title is not part of the earliest tradition, (p.4) but was taken up as an interpretation of Jesus, even though in one earlier passage Jesus is not the Son but Lord of David.

Jesus asks the Pharisees directly whose Son Christ is. Matthew's version varies from Mark in introducing Pharisees and securing their direct answer rather than the teaching of the Scribes. This passage is sometimes wrongly interpreted as a repudiation by Jesus of Davidic Messiahship or of earthly sovereignty. It was not a mere verbal victory over the Pharisees who are Matthew's special aversion. It is rather the suggestion of an idea new to the people, but backed by Scriptural proof, that the Messiah was of an origin and position that was superior even to David. The Psalm had not been quoted as Messianic previously.[1] That Jesus thought of himself as Messiah is a clear Matthean conception that shows with much greater emphasis than in his Markan source or "Q". It is easy to see that Paul with his conception of a heavenly, Messianic Figure who is also of the 'seed of David' is closely related to Matthew. There is no verbal similarity. The likeness does not depend on philology though Von Soden maintains that throughout Matthew there is striking relationship to Paul. "Besonders zahlreich sind die Beruhrungen mit paulinischer Terminologie, doppelt auffallend; da das Evangelium im gegensatz zu Luc. mit der paulinischen Theologie nirgends die leiseste Fühlung zeigt."[2] It may be doubted that there is no relationship with Pauline theology. The evident heightening of Messianic claims in Matthew is

---

1. McNeile, St. Matthew, 328, states it is not known as referring to Messiah in Jewish writings until A.D.260.
2. Theologische Abhandlungen, 156.

intelligible at least in the light of the strong Pauline teachings which constantly exalted Christ with every prerogative short of absolute identity with God. The exaltation of Christ in Paul's letters fits very well into the "purple and gold" claims of Matthew.

SON OF MAN "The use of the phrase Son of Man in the gospels is of extraordinary difficulty."[1] When George Foot Moore concedes that the phrase is difficult, there is little question about it. The literature on the subject is voluminous but the purpose here is to limit the problem to Matthew and Paul, as far as possible. The "Son of Man" is a favorite expression of the First Evangelist. "The Compiler of Matthew found the expression used fourteen times in Mark; and he has kept all of these. Besides these cases, he uses it nineteen times."[2] According to the table in Beginnings of Christianity[3] we find the following usage: (See next page.)

---

1. Judaism, II, 335.
2. Plummer, St. Matthew, XXVI.
3. I, 375-6; Cf. table of Synoptic usage, DuPont, Le Fils d' l'Homme, 104-5. "Les questions qui se posent à propos du Fils de l'Homme...en font un des problèmes les plus difficiles de la theologie du N.T." DuPont, Le Fils de l'Homme,1. "Wir stehen vor dem verwickelstesten und verfahrenstem aller problem, welche die Leben-Jesu-Forschung, ja die ganze neutestamentliche Theologie zu lösen aufgibt" Holtzmann, Messiansches Bewusstsein Jesu, 50. "Die Frage...eine der allerwichtigsten, leider auch der verwickelsten ist", Völter, Jesus der Menschensohn,1.

I.

Mt.	and	Mk.		
9:6	-	2:10	-	Man
12:8	-	2:28	-	"
16:13	-	8:27	-	Mt.change
16:21	-	8:31	-	Passion
16:27	-	8:36	-	Parousia
16:28	-	9:1	-	Mt.change
17:9	-	9:9	-	Passion
17:12	-	9:12	-	"
17:22	-	9:31	-	"
20:18	-	10:33	-	"
20:28	-	10:45	-	"
24:30	-	13:26	-	Parousia
24:36	-	13:32	-	"
26:24	-	14:21	-	Passion
26:25	-	14:41	-	"
26:64	-	14:62	-	Parousia

II.

Mt.	and	I (Lk)		
8:20	-	9:58	-	I
11:19	-	7:34	-	"
12:32	-	12:10	-	Man
12:40	-	11:30	-	I (Sign of Jonah)
19:28	-	22:30	-	Parousia
24:27	-	17:24	-	"
24:37	-	17:26	-	"
24:44	-	12:40	-	"

III.

<u>Mt.only</u>

10:23	-	Parousia
13:37	-	I
13:41	-	I (Not in W-H)
18:11	-	Parousia
24:30	-	"
25:31	-	"
26:2	-	Passion

From the tables given, several points are noticeable. (1) Son of Man was used by Jesus himself sometimes as another term for "I" and sometimes for "man." (2) It also had Messianic reference. (3) It was related to Jesus' suffering and death. There have been disputes over the possibility of Jesus himself using "Son of Man." Some (like Wellhausen and Lietzmann) have claimed that it would be unintelligible in Palestinian Aramaic; others have held (like Dalman) that Jesus might well have used the term.[1] But the present opinion of the majority is with the pronouncement of the authors of the Beginnings of Christianity.[2] "Few things are so probable as the use of Son of Man by Jesus."[3] The use of the term as a synonym for man, all will admit. That the Christians accepted Jesus as the anointed Son of Man is apparent from Gospel usage, though not all will agree with Foakes-Jackson and Lake that Son of David naturally was accepted and identified later with Son of Man.[4] They also argue that though Isaiah is quoted by Matthew he does not identify the suffering Servant and Jesus. The Servant is identified with Jesus (Mt.12:17) but not in reference to his suffering but to his miracles.[5] Such a distinction is hard to follow. A study

---

1. Rawlinson, N.T. Doctrine of Christ, 242f; Bacon, the Son of Man in the Usage of Jesus, JBL.,XLI,142.
2. I,374.
3. For contrary view, cf. Patton, Jour. of Rel.II,5, 501-511.
4. Begin. of Christianity, I, 374.
5. Ibid, 388-9.

of Matthew's special usage of the term is in order. Matthean usage of Son of Man is more distinctive than that of either of the other Synoptics. He changes Mark 8:27 from "Who do men say that I am?" to "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" Perhaps he was trying to explain to Greek readers the equivalence of Son of Man and Christ.[1] Mark 9:1 "till they see the kingdom of God come with power" becomes "till they see the Son of Man coming into his kingdom." (Mt.16:28) The two references in 13:37 and 13:41 where Son of Man is equivalent to the first personal pronoun contribute no special light except to show Matthew's fondness for the term. 10:23, 18:11, 24:30, 25:31 all have reference to the Parousia of the Son of Man and will be given detailed consideration in a later section on eschatalogy. For Matthew the chief figure in the Parousia is the great and glorified Son of Man. It is clear from 26:2 as well as other passages not peculiar to Matthew, that Jesus spoke of his sufferings in the future. The term Son of Man naturally would not be expected to be applied to one who was to suffer. Servant would be much more appropriate but Matthew is writing at a time when the suffering is past and the glorified Son of Man was expected. Moreover it may be that Jesus' own usage of the term in these instances was intended to point not only to suffering and death but also to triumph and that

---

1. Rawlinson, N.T. Doctrine of Christ, 244.

the best term available was the Son of Man. It was most free from national and political hopes. Taken as a whole Matthew's usage shows very clear tendencies to present Jesus as an exalted figure,--the Son of Man, i.e. the Messiah.[1]

The term does not appear in Paul's epistles. But "one cannot object to the non-appearance of the term in Paul, because Paul had other means of presenting the same doctrine and unlike the evangelists was not translating from Aramaic."[2] "The phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is as devoid of intelligible meaning in Greek as it is in English. It is clearly a literal translation of the Aramaic Bar-nash or Bar-nasha."[3] Its earliest use is in Daniel 7:9-14 where its meaning is variously explained. "A preference for idiomatic rendering perhaps explains the absence of the phrase in the Pauline epistles. All the essentials of the eschatological doctrine connoted by the apocalyptic Son of Man are found in Paul, but not the phrase itself. Is this not because he was too good a Grecian to translate Bar-nasha by so impossible a phrase as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and rendered it idiomatically by ὁ ἄνθρωπος . When, for instance, he speaks in I Cor.15:47 of the second "man" as the Lord from Heaven, is he not think-

---

1. DuPont, Le Fils de' l' Homme, 94.
2. Bacon, art. J.B.L. XLI,1922,144; DuPont, Le Fils de l'Homme, 88; Weinel, Bib. Theol. N.T., 412,419; Feine, Jesus Christus und Paulus, 211.
3. Beg. of Christianity I, 368; Cf. "Barbarische Wortgruppe," "Er musste sie gräzisieren in 'der Mensch'" Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 374.

ing of the Bar-nasha of Enoch?"[1] At least it is rather strange that the favorite self designation of Jesus[2] found no place in Paul's letters. But Pauline Christology did not develop apart from the early church though in the heat of the Galatian controversy he states that his gospel was not "from man" (Gal.1:11). He had constant contacts with Peter and other followers of Jesus and with the Jerusalem church, as Knox proves throughout his recent book.[3] Paul did not create the Son of Man ideas. Like most of his Christology, he "developed conceptions already current in the church of a pre-existing being of a superhuman order."[4] Our problem is to determine whether his developed conceptions are in evidence in Matthew. It is definitely certain that Paul had known of the Son of Man ideas of the primitive Christian community. His use (I Cor.15:27) of Ps.8:5-6 where Christ is made for a time lower than the angels in order to be crowned with glory and honor is clear proof.[5] And the "second man" (I Cor.15:47) from heaven indicates the same thought, though these ideas are not in the foreground of his

---

1. Ibid, 380; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 77.
2. But Dupont, op.cit., 89, thinks it impossible that Paul would have ignored the title if Jesus had taken it; Wernle, Begin. of Christianity, I,248, thinks Paul abandoned it as unsuited to his Greek readers.
3. St. Paul and the Church in Jerusalem.
4. Ibid, 31.
5. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 374.

thought. Bousset and others have held that the Iranian Myth of an antemundane heavenly man lies behind the conception of the Son of Man as it appears in late Judaism and the gospels.[1] But this suggestion is not needed for the "specialized usage of the term Son of Man finds its explanation in the remains of Jewish Apocalyptic literature and in particular in the Book of Enoch."[2] In Paul the heavenly man becomes a second Adam. This represents an intermediate stage between the early apocalyptic ideas associated with Son of Man and the later ideas that connected Son of Man with the Incarnation. In Paul the Son of Man comes to earth and lived and died and after resurrection will come to judge the earth. His thought runs parallel to Matthew except in the pre-existence of the Son of Man and is very similar in the apocalyptic sense. There are notable similarities here which will be compared in the section on eschatalogy. In general, it may be said, that in the Son of Man ideas of the earthly life there is no Pauline influence but the heavenly aspects are yet to be considered. Paul's notable development was the combination of the heavenly man and the earthly Davidic

---

1. Creed, The Heavenly Man, J.T.S., XXVI, 102, (Jan. 1925) 129.
2. Ibid, 129f; Rawlinson (N.T. Doctrine of Christ, 126) gives a complete list of quotations from Enoch which prove the above claim. (See also the discussion in Eschatology, the final section of this dissertation.)

Messiah.[1] The resurrection made this possible. Evidently he did not feel it necessary to explain such a relation. Matthew looks toward a relation of Jesus and God that shows an advance beyond Mark but it is questionable whether on this point he owes anything to Pauline teaching. Their teaching on Jesus as Son of God will help clear the situation.

SON OF GOD "Son of God could be taken by a Jew of the first century with a wide range of meaning depending entirely on his view of the context. (1) In contrast with Son of Man it might be used for a god but as Jehovah was the only God, the Sons of God in the Old Testament were necessarily regarded as Angels. (2) Since Jehovah was a Father to Israel the true representative of Israel was in a special sense his son. (3) This representative was sometimes identified with the King and hence especially with the expected Messiah. (4) Sometimes he was identified with 'righteous' i.e. the true Israel, and found consolation for their sufferings in the consciousness of their relation to God."[2] This passage sums up the meaning of the term, Son of God, at the time the New Testament was written. In a city like Antioch, "diesem eigentlichen Mutterboden des Synkretismus"[3]

---

1. McNeile, N.T. Tchg. in the Light of St. Paul's, 33; J.Weiss, Christ, 62, "He brought the form of one who had become man and was crucified, into union with the extremely high, superhuman notion of the pre-existent Christ, existing before all worlds."
2. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Begin. of Christianity, I, 395.
3. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 577.

"υἱὸς θεοῦ "came to mean, in accordance with Semitic idiom, in the Greek spoken by hellenized Semitic populations, a 'divine being', a 'god', a 'supernatural person', the virtual equivalent of θεῖος ἄνθρωπος or even of θεὸς ἐπιφανής . On a background of pantheism and polytheism deification was easy. The fundamental idea is that of τὸ θεῖον , supernatural quality or power which was the common characteristic both of Gods and of other supernatural persons, such as deified men."[1] As Wetter points out there is a question whether the synoptic writers took the Son of God usage from Judaism or Hellenistic piety.[2] He thinks there is some of both.[3] Wendt holds that the term would have been known as referring to the Messiah,[4] but Burton thinks there is no clear evidence of such recognition among the Jews of the first half of the first Christian century.[5]

The term Son of God appears in Matthew twice in the Temptation account credited to the devil, (4:2,6); in the words of Gadarene demoniac (8:29); on the lips of the apostles after the walking upon the water (14:33); in Peter's confession (16:16); as a question by the high priest (26:63); as a taunt from enemies (chief priests, scribes, elders)

---

1. Rawlinson, N.T. Doctrine of Christ, 70; Wetter, Der Sohn Gottes, 48.
2. Ibid, 139.
3. Ibid, 144.
4. Teaching of Jesus, II,130.
5. Galatians, 407 (note.).

while on the cross (27:44); as a tribute from the Roman centurion at death (27:54). Two of these references are found only in Matthew. (14:33, 16:16) There is almost an equal number of references where Jesus is addressed as My Son or Son. A quotation (Hos.11:1) is introduced in 2:15; "out of Egypt have I called my Son"; at the baptism (3:17) "This is my beloved Son"; the so-called 'Johannine passage' (11:27-28) uses the term Son three times; the Transfiguration scene repeats the baptismal words (17:5); in the parable of the husbandmen, "they will reverence my Son" clearly indicates Jesus; in 24:36 the Son disclaims knowledge of the end; in 28:19 the baptismal formula includes the Son. In these passages the Matthean hand is seen in the prophecy (2:15) and in the great commission (28:10). This question of sonship involves the Fatherhood of God. Not only does Matthew show a special fondness for "Son of God" and "my Son" but the following table from "The Beginnings of Christianity"[1] most clearly indicates an unusual fondness for introducing "my Father" and "Thy Father", on the part of Matthew. A special relationship of Jesus to God is evidently in his mind.

	Mk.	I.	Mt.	Lk.	Jo.
My Father	0	2	18	4	24
The Father	1	2	2	6	77
Your Father	0	4	18	3	1
Father (vocative)	1	3	6	3	5

1. I, 402.

Matthew's ideas of Sonship thus stand out prominently in certain points. He nowhere represents Jesus as calling himself Son of God, though "the Son" is in Jesus' words (11:27-28). Most probably the Virgin Birth narrative explained for Matthew the unique relationship of Jesus and God. On the lips of the demoniac or the centurion or Caiaphas it may be interpreted as either Messianic or as expressing greatness more than human. In the baptismal account and at the Temptation it is clearly related to the Messianic office. Jesus was ready to be the Messiah because of a filial consciousness. The latter was a stepping stone to the former.[1] The most important and deliberate usage of "My Father" in Matthew shows a relationship of Jesus different from other men. It is questionable whether Matthew has any metaphysical thought here but there is rather an ethical and religious idea based upon Jesus' fulfillment of the Father's will. The crucial passage is 11:27-28. These great words in the Synoptic gospels (Mt. and Lk.) have occasioned much comment. In John's gospel they would be taken for granted, but in Matthew "they are a thunderbolt from the Johannine sky."[2] They show that Jesus was accustomed to speak of himself in a special relationship to the Father. To say that "the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God,[3]" is not to give full credit to

---

1. Harnack, Sayings of Jesus, 245-6.
2. Rawlinson, N.T. Doctrine of Christ, 51.
3. Harnack, What is Christianity, 128.

their significance. Nor is Bacon's opinion adequate which considers Jesus as thinking of himself as Son of God because he is the first born, the champion of the "lost sheep of Israel."[1] The full and exact meaning for Jesus of these famous words may never be determined but Weiss is correct in regarding them from the aspect of the early community. "In ihm ist wohl das Höchste enthalten, was die Urgemeinde von dem irdischen Jesus auszusagen wusste."[2]

The Sonship of Jesus is clearly evident in many of Paul's epistles. "Son of God" occurs in passages of great import. (Rom. 8:32; I.Cor. 1:9, Gal. 2:20) The idea frequently appears in his opening and closing passages. It is related to his resurrection (Rom. 1:4), though sonship did not begin there as sometimes held. He is the "Son of His love." He even has an unbeginning life with God (Col. 1:15); and was "sent forth" (Gal.4:4); he had a share in Israel's past as the 'Rock' (I Cor.10:4); and in Phil. 2:5-7 there is a classic passage setting forth Paul's idea of Jesus' kenosis, though the term Son does not appear in it. He is an "only" Son (Rom.8:3; Gal.4:4; 2 Cor.1:19). Summing up, for Paul the Son means that Jesus was in a special relationship with God, that he knew a previous state of existance, even sharing in creation, that he took man's estate and laid aside his glory and became obedient even to the cross, and

---

1. Jesus, The Son of God, 32.
2. Das Urchristentum, 87.

therefore God has highly exalted him.[1]

As for relations between Paul and Matthew it has been suggested that Paul's "Abba" (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:5) (Father) usage is reflected in Matthew. It is true both use the terms extensively but no dependence beyond a common tradition can be proved though the similarity is striking. The famous Father and Son passage (11:25,28) has Pauline parallels especially in the word νήπιοι ("babes") which is found eleven times in Paul only and again in Mt. 21:16.[2]

Burton, Galatians, 410, summarizes thus:

1. (A) The ethico-religious sense. In this sense Paul uses the term both of Christ and of men, though clearly assigning it to Jesus in unique measure, and in some cases basing the sonship of men on their possession of the Spirit of the Son.

    1. The affectional sense, denoting one who is object of divine love. (Gal.3:26; 4:4,6,7; Rom.5:10; 8:3, 19,32; Col.1:13).

    2. The moral sense, denoting one who is morally like God, being led by his Spirit, doing his will; as applied to Christ, consequently a revelation of God (Gal.1:16; I Cor.1:9; Rom.8:14f,29).

    3. With these two ideas Paul associates the idea of freedom. (e.g.son--not slave) (Gal.4:7; Rom.8:14-17)

   (B) The official and theocratic sense, denoting one who exercises divine power for God; applied to Christ only: (I Thess.1:10; I Cor.15:28; 2 Cor.1:19; Rom.1:3,4,9);

   Wernle, (Begin. of Christianity I, 250) credits Paul with the creation of a "new Christology" in his conception of the Son of God -- a conception which he drew from a mythical being and linked up to the Jesus of history. Wernle rather overdoes the mythological background at this point.

2. Bacon, The Son of God, 5.

Also the passage in I Cor. 1:19-21 is so similar that direct literary dependence has been urged by Pfleiderer.[1] "Moreover an evangelist (i.e. Mt.) demonstrably dependent on Mark, one who takes over and improves upon the 'high' Christology of his predecessor, and who seems even to have adapted this very logion (11:25-28) to the form of a post-resurrection commission to the apostles to make converts of all nations (Mt. 28:18) may well have accepted a Pauline Christology with all its implications of pre-existence."[2] The Knowing-God and Being-Known antithesis may be paralleled in Paul by his counsel to the Galatians (4:6) who have known and been known of God (Cf. also I Cor. 13:12). Bacon does not here determine which way the influence lies.[3] The story of the Transfiguration is an attempt by an apocalyptic transcendentalizing to set forth quasi-Pauline or Pauline Christology. (Cf. Mt. 17:1-8 and Rom. 12:2; II Cor. 3:18; Phil. 3:21; II Cor. 5:1,4). This assumes that the heavenly aspects of the Transfiguration are due to Paul's stress on the same ideas about Jesus. These attempts appear rather forced when taken separately, except perhaps the parallels in the Father-Son passage (11:25-28). But the comparative study yields the impression that both Matthew and Paul are proceeding toward an advancing Christology. "It is impossible to trace with

---

1. Ibid, 4.
2. Ibid, 3.
3. Ibid, 15.

accuracy and certainty the connection between the representation of Jesus' consciousness which underlies the usage of the synoptic gospels and the Pauline usage."[1] But Matthew's exaltation of Jesus is more akin to Paul's than the other gospels. No fewer than ten times does Matthew speak of men rendering worship or paying homage to Jesus. (προσκυείν).[2] Such an attitude occurs once in Luke at the Ascension, and twice in Mark--once in mockery by the soldiers and once by the Gadarene demoniac. Matthew omits the questions that Jesus asks in Mark, from which it appears that he thought of Jesus, like John, as not needing to ask questions. "Matthieu fait voir que Jésus est le Christ, le Messie annoncé par les prophètes, le sauveur du people d' Israël. Cette tendance ne lui a pas été inspirée seulement par la nature de ses préoccupations personnelles mais surtout par les besoins religieux du public judéo-chrétien auquel il s'addressant."[3] Matthew's fondness for "Son of God" and "my Father", which stress a unique relationship are in direct line with Paul's teaching but with the exception of the Father-Son passage, there is no evidence weighty enough to admit direct influence. In the case of 11:25-28, which is generally admitted to be a problem in its present setting, Pauline ideas can be found. "Whenever I read I Cor. 1:19-21 I am ever again

---

1. Burton, Galatians, 417.
2. Wood, Some Characteristics of Synoptic Gospels, 164.
3. Roehrich, Le Composition des Évangiles, 195.

struck by the coincidence here both in thought and vocabulary with our saying, though all of course has passed through the crucible of the Pauline mind. Nevertheless impressions are deceptive and are in this instance far from attaining to the dignity of a proof."[1] The stress on knowing, the Father-Son relation, the revelation through the Son, the sense of sovereignty, almost predestination ("to whomsoever the Son willeth"), the revelation to babes rather than the wise and understanding, the cosmic lordship of the Father, the meekness and lowliness of Jesus -- these combine to produce an impression of Matthew's representation of the Son of God under the illuminating impressions which Paul had been spreading abroad for years. Paul's idea of a sonship is the most exalted conception of Jesus that he held, and it is broader than Matthew's. The latter indicates Messiahship, a unique relationship or filial consciousness on Jesus' part, and probably a special birth or earthly origin, and finally an approving love of the

---

1. Harnack, Sayings of Jesus, note, 301. He accepts the saying as genuine from Jesus but rejects Pfleiderer's (Das Urch.I,435) suggestion that there is dependence here on Paul. Cf. Burton, Jesus and Paul in Christianity in the Modern World,88. "The fact of its altogether exceptional character among synoptic messages, its manifest resemblance in thought and language to the Fourth Gospel and the fact that the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, in which it is found, were written years after Paul had embodied thoughts akin to these in his epistles,though not expressing them in this language, strongly suggests that in this exceptional passage we have a reflection of a type of thought and a fragment of a tradition, quite different from those which the Synoptic gospels elsewhere suggest."

Father for his Son. But Paul appears to use the term to cover any of his earthly or exalted ideas of Jesus. "Diesen nun einmal uberkommenen Namen für den Messias wird such Paulus in dieser 'dynamischen' oder begrifflichen Weise zurechtgelegt haben, indem er ihn mit den ebenfalls überkommenen Hypostasen-Vorstellungen Doxa, Dynamis, Pneuma, Logos kombinierte."[1]

KURIOS The next title for consideration is ὁ κύριος or κύριε. The latter occurs nineteen times in Matthew, (once in Mark and sixteen in Luke).[2] Inasmuch as the primitive title appears to have been Rabbi or Teacher the Matthean usage tends to show a development similar to Paul's whose ὁ κύριος appears so very frequently.[3] Mark's favorite word for Jesus is διδάσκαλος (Teacher) but in both Luke and Matthew the Teacher becomes Lord. Matthew has the term in the vocative form in the following passages: 7:21,22, 8:2,5,8,21,25, <u>9:28</u>, <u>14:28,30</u>, <u>15:22</u>,25,27, 16:22, 17:4,<u>15</u>, <u>18:21</u>, 20:30,31,33, 26:22. (Cf 22:43-4). Those underlined are in passages peculiar to Matthew. He uses διδάσκαλος only once (17:24). The term Lord is also frequently used by Matthew in quoting Scripture or in relating parables where its application is not to Jesus. An analysis of the passages where Lord is used as a term of address to Jesus shows that

---

1. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 368.
2. Streeter, Four Gospels, 162. (This statement gave no references. A count in Mt. revealed 21 times.)
3. κύριος appears 232 times, Cf. Mathews, Mess. Hope in N.T., 190 (note).

Jesus himself used it, "many will say unto me Lord, Lord," (7:21-2); and that it is used often by those in need like the leper, the centurion, the Canaanitish woman, the blind men, the father of the epileptic and the disciples and especially by Peter. The meaning of the usage in Matthew is the point to be determined here.

Starting with Bousset's notable "Kyrios Christos" there has been much recent discussion about Kurios. In general, Bousset's position is concerned only with ὁ κύριος because he holds the vocative (κύριε) to mean only the equivalent of "Sir." He believes that the primitive Christians did not use Lord for Jesus but that it grew up in Greek speaking Christian circles, notably Antioch.[1] It is true that there is a surprising lack of κύριος in the gospels when we remember how central it is in Paul. But back of Kurios is the Aramaic word Maran or Mar and "there is not much reason to doubt that some persons may have addressed Jesus as Mari."[2] By the time

---

1. Kyrios Christos, 77-84, 119f; Cf. Deissmann, Paul,125 (note) "Bousset's thesis that the Kyrios-cult arose in Syria is not illuminating to me. Compare against it E.Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, 218."
2. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, 45; Rawlinson, N.T. Doctrine concerning Christ, 231-237, undertakes to refute Bousset; Cf. Beg. of Christianity, I, 408-417; Weiss, Urchristentum, 351-355,576; Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 249-255; Case, κύριος as a title for Christ, J.B.L.,1907, 151-161; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 83f. thinks Lord could not have any divine significance in any Jewish environment. It grew up among Gentiles.

Matthew wrote the term was turned into its Greek equivalent and was in common Christian usage as Acts shows. "So historically the consciousness of Jesus that he was the Christ and the Jesus-cult of the Apostles work into one another; nevertheless the cult itself first came into birth as a result of the mystery of the Apostles' Easter-experiences. And if we cannot penetrate the sacred morning twilight of this secret with light from the torch of exact scientific study and thus reduce the whole ancient mystery into modern obviousness, clear as day, we yet possess in the beginnings of the Jesus-cult an exemplar of the origin of a new cult, probably unique in the whole history of ancient religions."[1] No doubt the influence of the Septuagint translation of the tetragrammaton by κύριος had helped in the development also. Often in Matthew the term may mean only "Sir" but he was writing years after the Resurrection which changed the attitude of the early followers from companions to believers in a Lord for whom God had done most extraordinary things. It had become a title of worship. Some of the places can hardly mean a mere "Sir." Where Jesus is represented as using it (7:21-22; 25:37-44) as addressed to him in deference to his supreme power on the last day, the title is much more than "Sir." The appeals of disciples or Peter on the lake or of the helpless sick or suffering ones can carry more than a mere vocative meaning.

---

1. Deissmann, Paul, 124.

The question centers on whether in Matthew the term Lord meant only a title as for any person or whether it meant the Divine Lord of a group of believers or cult. In Matthew the latter must also be included with the former. That Paul found Kurios in the church when he became a Christian is probable, (Acts 2:36) though its usage was not developed as it came to be with him later. But he quotes it from the Aramaic, (I Cor. 16:22) Maranatha. No doubt he knew of the oriental cults of the East and his Lord—teaching may bear some of their influence but it may be urged against Bousset that the cults were not the original of Paul's thought.[1] He adapted his message to his hearers and since Lord was a familiar term he used it for Jesus. His summary of preaching is "we preach Christ Jesus as Lord" (2 Cor. 4:5.) "for he is Lord of all, rich towards all those who call upon him" (Rom. 10:12); the necessary condition of salvation is to confess Jesus a Lord (Rom.10:9, Eph. 5:26). "No one is able to say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Spirit." (I Cor.12:3) brings to mind Matthew's account of Peter's confession of Jesus as Lord, not by flesh and blood revelation. Jesus is Lord both of the living and the dead because he has passed through those experiences triumphantly (Rom.14:9). He is highly exalted and at his name every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord (Phil.2:9-11) and this in turn

---

1. Kyrios Christos, 98-9.

recalls the fact that many will say Lord, Lord in that day (Mt. 7:21-22) as Matthew relates it. Paul knew only one Lord though there were 'Lords many' (Eph.4:4). It is noticeable that Paul uses the term Lord most frequently for Jesus and very infrequently for God, and that some of the attributes of Lord in the Old Testament are transferred to Jesus in the New. "It gave to him a religious significance hardly to be distinguished from that which men assigned to God."[1] For in the expression "Our Lord Jesus Christ" the whole primitive Christian religion is contained in germ. "So the use of the name Kurios becomes a bridge, leading to the last and loftiest affirmations concerning Christ."[2] The most that can be said on this point is that Paul and Matthew were building on the same bridge and occasional parallels indicate that Matthew's fondness for Lord may have been partially created by an Antiochene and Pauline usage which was well known when he wrote. Sharman suggests that since one of the Matthean traits was "to eliminate all demoniac confessions of Jesus as the Christ," that "perhaps Matthew acted in this particular under the influence of such a thought as that of I Cor. 12:3 'no man can say Jesus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit'."[3] There is no clear proof but the supposition is possible, because Paul used the term in the highest theocratic sense possible. "Jesus is Lord" is

---

1. Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 254.
2. Weiss, Christ, the Beginnings of Dogma, 46,52.
3. Teaching of Jesus about Future, 10.

the distinctively Christian confession (Rom.10:9, I Cor. 12: 3; Phil. 2:11). It meant ownership, service and obedience. "To accept him (Jesus) as Lord in this highest sense of the expression is to bow ~~to~~ the will to him as God."[1] This theocratic sense of the term is mostly due to Paul and the Matthean usage seems to reflect the Pauline thinking.

WISDOM There is one lesser point for comparison which depends on the interpretation of Mt. 23:34-36 (Cf. Mt. 11:19, 12:42). This passage reads, "Therefore behold I am sending to you prophets and wise men and scribes." In Lk. 11:49 it reads, "Therefore the wisdom of God saith I will send among them prophets and apostles." Which saying is more original, it is difficult to say. It may be that Matthew identifies Christ and Wisdom, though McNeile thinks first in his commentary this is correct[2] but in a later volume thinks Matthew is only quoting a well known saying from Wisdom Literature.[3] Findlay holds that the "first evangelist assumes, without explanation that Jesus himself is the Wisdom of God."[4] If it is assumed that the latter interpretation is correct, it is interesting to know that Paul refers to Wisdom (σοφία) twenty-eight times.[5] There is no question but that he knew Wisdom literature[6] and applied its terminology to Jesus. "Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God (I Cor.1:24), "Christ in

---

1. Burton, Galatians, 401, 403.
2. St. Matthew, 339
3. N.T. Tchg in Light of St. Paul's, 58.
4. Jesus in the First Gospel, 73.
5. Bacon. (Art) Wisdom, D.C.9., II, 526.
6. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 51-2.

whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid." (Col.3:3) It is only a possibility that Matthew had heard Pauline terminology and so interpreted Jesus as the Wisdom of God also. This is partly supported by the fact that it appears difficult to think of Jesus himself making the claim since Luke gives another rendering but it is possible to see the evangelist make the assumption. At most, it may be said that the point is not at all decisive.

DEATH The next point for consideration is the death and resurrection of Jesus. It is well to remember here that both Paul and Matthew present writings which represent the thought of those who are looking back across some years to events in the life of Jesus which were so astounding that they had to be interpreted. One may not entirely agree[1] with Bultmann that the gospel is "eine Schöpfung der hellenistischen Gemeinde" because it was necessary to have some combination of Kurios cult and the historical person of Jesus but it is certain that "Diese Werke (Synoptics) stehen ganz im Dienste des Christlichen Glaubens und Kults."[2] The death of Jesus demanded some explanation. In Matthew the Messiah is triumphant through suffering; he is a King who entered his Kingdom and "died as a claimant to royal power."[3] That

---

1. Weiss, Das Urchristentum,8-9, "Dass der grösste Teil des Evangelienstoffen nicht in den missionsgemeinden des apostolischen Zeitalters enstanden ist, sondern ans der Urgemeinde übernommen ist, kann nicht bezweifelt werden."
2. Bultmann, Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition, 226,229.
3. Allen, St. Matthew, LXV, 1.

his death is supremely important appears from the space devoted to it. Jesus is shown as looking forward to his death from the time of Caesarea Philippi, (16:21). He repeats his predictions. (17:22, 20:18, 26:13,28). His fate is evidently foretold in the parable of the husbandmen (21:39). It has been argued that this parable indicates Jesus' purpose in coming was to live but the point is rather in his death. That his death is most impressive is evident from the supernatural portents with which Matthew surrounds it, the darkness, earthquake, rent veil and walking of saints long dead. Even a Roman centurion rendered his tribute of praise. As far as any expression of purpose in his death may be found in Matthew it is evident in 20:28 "to give his life a ransom for many." At the last supper also (26:28) "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins," the same idea is expressed.

In Paul the importance of Jesus' death can hardly be overstated. He states that he learned from other early Christians (I Cor.15:3) that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." He knew of Christ's crucifixion (Gal. 3:1). God sent his own son as an offering for sin (Rom.8:4). Christ died for us (Rom.5:6). He redeemed mankind from law and became a curse in their stead. (Gal.3:13, 5:4) Paul felt that there was a personal reference in Jesus' death. He "gave himself up for me" (Gal.2:20). He came as a sin offering (Rom.8:3). The Law had a penalty for sin but God had been

forbearing and set forth Christ as a propitiation (Rom.3:25) that is, God has given man what he can not have gained for himself. He was "delivered up for our sins and was raised for our justification." (Rom.4:24) He died for all (2 Cor. 5:19). God did not spare his own Son but "delivered him up for us all." (Rom.8:32) The cross is the center of Paul's preaching even though it be "foolishness" (I Cor.1:21). "The word of the Cross" (I Cor.1:18) sums up the gospel. These do not cover all of Paul's references to the death of Jesus but they are among the most important. Out of Paul's statements, it may be gathered that he regarded the death of Jesus much as the early Christians did and it is notable that while he had trouble over his interpretation of the Law, he did not have trouble with his statements of Christology. There is only one point of marked similarity with Matthew who alone has "unto remission of sins." Paul writes "Christ died for our sins" (I Cor.15:3). But though Matthew is notable for inserting the phrase, yet since Paul states that he received his teaching, it is more probable that both are reflecting a current belief of the Christian community regarding Jesus' death, though it is possible that Matthew's use of the idea is influenced by the strong Pauline stress on Jesus' death and its relation to sin. More consideration will be given under the heading of soteriology.

RESURRECTION Matthew's resurrection accounts include supernatural events like an earthquake, an angel

who rolled away the stone, the overwhelming of the watchers, the appearance to the women near the tomb and the appearance to the Eleven in Galilee. There are also references to the fact of resurrection before the events (Mt. 12:40, 16:21, 17:9, 20:19, 27:63). For Paul, Christ's resurrection has supreme importance. It marked him out as Son of God with power (Rom.1:4). He thus became Lord of the dead and living (Rom.14:9). Belief in the resurrection conditioned salvation. (Rom.10:9). Paul received his account and it included appearances of Christ to Cephas, the Twelve, the Five Hundred, James, the Apostles and to himself. While Paul is probably not attempting a proof by listing all the known appearances, it is curious that he omits mention of the appearance to women and gives no location for the events. It may be due to ignorance or indifference. It may be pointed out that Paul and Matthew state the appearances to be the third day whereas Mark has "after three days." It is noteworthy that Paul and Matthew agree in the use of ἐγείρεσθαι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ , while Mark has ἀναστάναι μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας . But it is doubtful whether Matthew and Paul reflect an earlier usage than Mark.[1] But the detail is too small to have weight and both evangelists probably meant the same thing. Matthew

---

1. Stead, (Expositor, 8 ser.No.131,400) thinks the Matthew and Paul usage stresses the activity of the Father in raising Jesus from the dead while in Mark Jesus' own activity is stressed.

even represents one forecast of the fourth day (12:40) (Cf.28:1). There is agreement on the "third day," the appearance to the disciples, the immediate exaltation after death, and the general certainty of the great fact that Jesus is risen but the differences are weighty, and decisive. There is no definite location of the appearances in Paul. In Matthew, Jesus appears not only to women in Jerusalem but to the Eleven in Galilee. Inasmuch as the Lukan-Johannine accounts record appearances only in Jerusalem, these facts lead scholars like Weiss and Burkitt to directly opposite conclusions. The former[1] gives Matthew-Mark the right while the latter[2] builds up the case for Luke-John. The correct position is to be found in "both-and" rather than "either-or." But Paul cares nothing for a definite locale for appearances. He does not mention the empty tomb. With Matthew it is a strong point so that even a Roman guard is recorded as watching it to guarantee against its vacancy. It is evident from Matthew's gospel (22:29) that the resurrection is due to the power of God, but following the usual Jewish belief, the risen Jesus is a glorified, reanimated Figure whose appearance was so similar to his earthly life that neither women nor apostles had any doubt in recognizing him. It is a living again of the fleshly body that was

---

1. Das Urchristentum, II.
2. Christian Beginnings.

placed in the tomb, although Matthew does not present the physical aspects that Luke and John do. There is already an exaltation to the place where all authority has been given. (28:18). For Paul no flesh and blood can inherit the kingdom of heaven (I Cor.15:15). The Lord that appears to him (I Cor.15:8) or is revealed in him (Gal.4:16) makes it possible for him to claim to have seen the Lord but it is κατὰ πνεῦμα not κατὰ σάρκα (II Cor.5:16). Moreover in Paul's resurrection ideas appear soteriological and eschatological references which must be considered in later sections. It is true that the change (μετεμορφώθη) in the Transfiguration account is sometimes interpreted in a Pauline way as equal to Paul's idea of exchange of fleshly body for a celestial one but it is forced exegesis and overlooks the fact that in the Transfiguration account, the earthly body is illuminated but in Paul it passes out of existence and a new or different body replaces it. (I Cor.15:42-50) There is also a difference in the fact that for Matthew Jesus is the Son of God by virtue of his supernatural birth whereas in Paul he "was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom.1:4, Phil.2:10). The similarities are insufficient and the differences are too great to indicate any relationship in thought about the resurrection in Matthew and Paul except such as had been received from a primitive tradition. In so far as Matthew tends to present Jesus as a glorified One to whom all power had been

given on heaven and earth, it can be claimed that his thought runs parallel to Paul's where Jesus is highly exalted after death so that at his name every knee should bow, but the resemblance is one denoting the increased mutual reverential attitude rather than one of depencence of Matthew on Paul.

Possibly the most direct claim of Pauline influence in Matthew's account of Jesus' death and resurrection is made by Montefiore.[1] After Jesus' death "many bodies of the saints who slept arose, and came out of their graves <u>after his resurrection</u>, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many." (Mt.27:53) Montefiore's comment on the verse states that "the original marvel meant to say that the bodies of the holy men came out of their graves and were seen in Jerusalem at or immediately after Jesus' death. But this miracle became incompatible with a dogma which Paul and his circle put into circulation. For according to that dogma Jesus was the first to rise from the dead -- 'the firstfruits of them that are asleep' (I Cor.15:20). How then, could these others have risen before Jesus? Hence a harmonist added the words, 'after his resurrection'. The holy men did not rise or at any rate, were not seen in the capital, till after Jesus' own resurrection. But the correction spoils the whole miracle, the point of which is that it happened simul-

---

1. Syn. Gospels, II, 349.

taneously with Jesus' death."[1]

SUMMARY The foregoing Christological survey may be summed up as follows: There is insufficient evidence for any influence of Pauline theology in the Matthean record of the events in Jesus' earthly life. In the use of titles the Son of David usage is similar in thought to Paul's ideas. The Son of Man gives no clear indication; Son of God shows similarities amounting practically to influence in the case especially of the Father-Son passage though it must be admitted that Bacon may be possibly correct in holding that here the "Pauline and Synoptic doctrines are parallels from a common root,"[2] i.e., the Wisdom literature of which the Odes of Solomon stand as a good example. Kurios shows no clear proof of influence. The death and resurrection show parallels without decisive evidence.

---

1. Box. (St.Matt.352) feels the difficulty also. "This (verse) looks like a later insertion to safeguard the truth that Christ was the firstfruits of them that sleep! But possibly the story, in the original tradition, was connected with Christ's resurrection and is here misplaced;" Allen attributes the troublesome phrase to the editor of Matthew under the influence of Paul's statement and suggests that by mistake or on purpose the editor altered 'their' to 'His'; Cf La Grange, St.Matthieu, 532; Weiss-Bousset, Die Schriften des N.T. -- St. Matthaus, I, 384,5; McNeile, St.Mt. 423-4.
2. Bacon, Harvard Theol. Rev. IX.4,p.415.

2. SOTERIOLOGY

JESUS AND SALVATION That Matthew held an advanced soteriological conception of Jesus' life appears early when the angel announced to Joseph the prospective birth of Jesus and stated that his name should be called Jesus "for it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (1:21). The claim is boldly advanced in the healing of the paralytic where the Son of Man has power to forgive sins (9:2). It appears again at the Last Supper where the words of Jesus assure the disciples that his blood of the covenant is "shed for many unto remission of sins." (26:28). εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν is found only in Matthew. In less striking fashion Matthew sets forth his account of Jesus' attitudes toward sin and forgiveness. The sermon on the Mount shows that the motive is the essential point e.g. in hatred, in adultery, in revenge. "Out of the heart" proceed all the evils (15:10). Jesus endorsed John the Baptist's work which included confession of sins and bringing forth fruit worthy of repentance (3:6) and Jesus added as a test of people "by their fruits ye shall know them" (7:20). The fact of forgiveness of debts (= sins, a thoroughly Jewish thought) is conditioned by forgiveness of others, (6:12). The debtor who was forgiven to the extent of 10,000 talents was much more blameable because he did not forgive a debt of 100 denarii. Peter's question about the extent of for-

giveness was answered by "until seventy times seven" (18:21). A stern warning against the last state being worse than the first is given to those who try to remain vacant of good intentions in following Jesus (12:45). There is a sin against the Holy Spirit which willfully mistakes the good for evil and it is unforgivable as compared with any sin against the Son of Man (i.e. man). In connection with the idea of unforgivable sins McNeile points out that "serious sin was often spoken of as unpardonable." (cf. Num. 15:30, I Sam.3:14, Isa.22:14).[1] Judging from the passages given above, Matthew believed in forgiveness of sins both by man and God and also by the Son of Man through power given by God. Moreover Jesus' coming had special significance for the remission of sins and his life was given at the close of his ministry as a ransom for many (20:28, 26:28). Matthew propounds no theory. He simply assumes that such a relation between Jesus' life and death and the salvation of many from sin is a known fact.

"Christianity according to St. Paul is best studied under the aspect of Salvation, inasmuch as Salvation is really the most comprehensive term for what the apostle found in Christ."[2] Such a complex term is not easily stated. "It

---

1. St. Matthew, 179.
2. Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul,17. Brückner, Z.N.T.W., 1906, 118, "Der Universalismus des Heils der eigentliche Lebensnerv und Zentralgedanke des ganzen Paulinismus ist."

is a spiritual state or condition which can be considered from three points of view. (1) Salvation is something due to God's undeserved grace and must be appropriated by faith. (Eph.2:5,8, Rom.8:24, Rom.10:9, I Cor.1:21, 15:2, Eph.1:13, I Thess,2:16, II Thess.2:10) (2) Those who have appropriated it are realizing it progressively (I Cor. 1:18, II Cor.2:15, Phil.2:12). (3) The final realization (Rom. 5: 9, I Thess. 5:9, II Thess.2:14, Rom.13:11)."[1] Scott adds further that Paul uses the verb σώζειν "to describe something that has happened in the past, resulting in an established status." (Rom. 8:24, Eph. 2:5).[2]

There are a number of points where Pauline ideas are tangent to Matthew's. Both evidently write with the background of an apocalyptic dualism with its concurrent doctrine of a new world that is to be created. Freedom from the bondage of disease or demons frequently appears in Matthew. Those who have faith are made whole. Usually it is in such cases that faith is used in the gospel. In Paul there is a "god of this age" (II Cor.4:4). There is a whole hierarchy of Principalities, Powers, and World Rulers of darkness. (Rom. 8:39, Eph. 6:12). Men were delivered from bondage to any such powers (Gal.1:4). Christ is to put his enemies under his feet (I Cor.15:24) and has already

---

1. McNeile, N.T. Tchg. in Light of St. Paul's, 148-9.
2. Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 23,24.

succeeded in his main purpose (Col.2:15). Thus men are redeemed from spirit forces of evil. These likenesses however are no more than such as might appear in two writers with a common belief. There is a similarity in the idea of a ransom (Mt.20:28, 26:28) and a price (I Cor.6:20, 7:23) (Cf. Isa.53:12). But here again there was no new or unknown teaching except as it was applied to Jesus. Both Matthew and Paul regard sin as overcome by the power of Jesus. Matthew usually has the plural and Paul the singular. For the latter sin had become a personified force. Rom. 7 illustrates this fact. "Sin slew me." "Sin entered into the world and death by sin." "The wages of sin is death." "I..am sold under sin," all men are under sin (Rom.3:9), bondservants of sin, (Rom.6:20, Gal.3:22). Until Christ came sin ruled (Rom.5:21). By one man, sin entered the world (Rom.5:12,15). Owing to the transgression of Adam all men die (I Cor.15:22). Jesus came in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom.8:3) and was made "to be sin for us" (II Cor. 5:21). Christ "died unto sin once for all" (Rom.6:10) and so God "condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom.8:3). Thus Christ triumphed over sin and broke its yoke of bondage. All this is Paul's way of saying that Christ as a man under God's perfect guidance, had provided a freedom from the domination of sin which had held men since Adam. It was a unique work. In Matthew the same idea is given, "he shall save his people

from their sins" (1:21, 26:28) but there is no theory worked out as in Paul. Matthew seems to be proceeding with his writing on the same basis as Paul that Jesus did a unique work in freeing man from the power of sin. There are many parallels in Paul who states that he "received" the gospel that "Christ died for our sins" (I Cor. 15:3) (Gal.1:4, Rom.4:25, 8:3, 2 Cor.5:15, I Thess.5:10, Col.2:14) The idea of Christ's death for man's sin was thus an early Christian teaching but Paul developed the ideas in a remarkable way. It is possible that Matthew's references came from the primitive teaching but they are not found in Mark and can be better understood as reflections of current beliefs which had been powerfully molded by Pauline thought.

SIN AND FLESH There is a strong feeling in Paul that sin is related to the flesh. "Das Fleisch ist also Sitz, Organ und Werkzeug der Sünde".[1] "Sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), "body of sins" (6:6) and "body of death" (7:24) are some of the terms which he applies to the flesh. But flesh is not essentially identified with sin, although sin is empirically related to the flesh. The relation is ethical and Paul held the usual Jewish view of Adam's original sinlessness (Rom.5:12). In such teaching as "the body is for the Lord" (I Cor.6:13) and it is to be a "living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (Rom.12:1) it is

---

1. Feine, Theol. des N.T., 316.

evident that the body is not essentially evil. It is a "temple of the Holy Spirit" (I.Cor.6:19-20) and the life of Jesus may be manifested in the body. Moreover since Paul believed in a historical Jesus who knew no sin it is clear that his view of sin and the body does not involve an identification of the two in any metaphysical sense.

In Matthew there is some of the same opposition between a willing spirit and weak flesh, (26:41) but there is no stress on the evil in the flesh. Matthew is expressing the usual antithesis of Hebrew thought. (Cf. Gal.4:13, Rom.6:19). In the passage about marriage (Mt.19:5) there is no evil imputed to the flesh. Likewise in the apocalyptic section (24:22) flesh is merely a synonym for mankind with no evil connotation.

BODY AND SPIRIT Paul holds to the usual dichotomy of his day.[1] The body (σῶμα) could be an instrument of either good or evil. The soul (ψυχή) was the natural non-corporeal element in human nature. It included the mind (νοῦς) or intellectual faculty (Rom. 8:25, I Cor.14:14-15). The soul which seems to be limited to life here, is not given any moral coloring per se. It is the vital principle of the flesh, the bearer of bodily life (Rom.16:4, 2 Cor.

---

1. I Thess. 5:23 is the only reference which could be interpreted as trichotomy. Cf.Toy, Judaism and Christianity, 180f; Charles,(Art) Eschatology, Ency. Bib. II, 1387-8.

12:5, Phil.2:30). But it appears as non-spiritual when contrasted with spirit (πνεῦμα) although Paul sometimes uses spirit "loosely of the mind and feelings in the sense of heart (I Cor. 2:11, 5:3, 16:18, 2 Cor.2:13, 7:13, Col. 2:5)."[1] Paul's usage of Spirit is difficult. Generally speaking, πνεῦμα meant the spiritual side of man. It may mean (1) the intellectual and moral part (Rom.7:22) or (2) the immaterial personality which survives death or (3) the immaterial part of man capable of direct intercourse with God (I Cor.14:14, Rom.8:16). This last distinction is peculiar to Paul and has no parallel in Matthew or the rest of the New Testament.[2] But when a man became a Christian he became spiritual. He was a new creature. He was filled with the Holy Spirit. He had already received the first fruits of the spirit. (Rom.8:23, 2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5). The Spirit dwells in him (Rom.8:11, I Cor.3:16, 6:19) and Christians are in the Spirit. (Rom. 8:9, 12:11, Eph. 4:3). It is a power working in their lives and a source of spiritual blessings (Rom.5:5, 8:6, I Cor.12, 2:10-16). The preventive of living spiritually is sin and as a Christian there is a Spirit which enables man to live on a higher or spiritual level. For Paul there is hardly a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the risen Christ. (Rom.9:1, I Cor.6:17, Gal.4:6, Eph.3:16-17, Phil.1:19, II Cor.3:17, I Cor.15:45) No idea of Paul is

---

1. McNeile, St. Paul, 280f.
2. Cf. Charles, (Art.) Eschat. Ency. Bib. II, 1388.

more characteristic than "in Christ." Deissmann has shown that it occurs 164 times in Paul's letters.[1] This Christ-mysticism has many far-reaching implications in Paul's thought. A full discussion is outside the province of this investigation because there is no parallel in Matthew, although Matthew is the only Synoptic writer who has any passages which suggest mysticism (18:19-20, 28:19-20).[2]

In Matthew the soul is the bearer of bodily, sensuous life (6:25, 23:35) or of a higher spiritual life (26:38, 10:39). References to man's spirit are few and generally mean the higher side of the soul or the seat of higher life or the part of man which survives death (27:50). The poor in spirit are blessed (5:3). A man who would save his life shall lose it (10:39). The Spirit is willing even when the flesh is weak (26:41). Finally, Jesus gave up the spirit (27:50). These passages exhibit no Pauline ideas except in the case of 26:41 which is similar to Paul's distinction between flesh and spirit but which shows no dependence because such a distinction is found both in the Old and New Testament writings.[3] There are more numerous

---

1. Religion of Jesus and Faith of Paul, 171. Cf. McNeile, St. Paul, 284f; Weber, Christusmystik; Campbell, St. Paul the Mystic.
2. McGiffert A.J.T., XI, 3, 421.
3. Pfleiderer, (Urchristentum, I,390) maintains that the opposition of flesh and spirit is specifically Pauline.

references to the Holy Spirit (1:18, 3:11,16, 4:1, 10:20, 12:28, 22:42, 28:19). The last reference to baptism in the Trinitarian formula clearly shows the same ideas of equating Father, Son and Spirit that appear in Paul in so many places. (This will be discussed more in the section on sacraments.) Jesus is born of the Holy Spirit, baptized and received the Spirit, by the Spirit of God, casts out devils and promises the "Spirit of your Father" to disciples who are to be persecuted. David has called the Messiah, Lord "in the Spirit." Apart from the Baptismal formula there is nothing in Matthew which indicates more than a common primitive Christian usage. There is nothing of the Christ-mysticism except "Lo I am with you" (28:20). There is frank recognition that Jesus had kinship with the Spirit of God and an uncommon fellowship with the Spirit so that he worked and spoke with its authority. The gospel shows more usage of the "Spirit" than Mark but not more than might be found in a community where Pentecostal beliefs were known. There are no Pauline elaborations of the position of Christians in a new and spiritual realm nor are there intricate explanations of justification. But Matthew alone has the striking verse where justification or condemnation are based on one's words. (12:36-37).

RIGHTEOUSNESS Moreover he has considerable interest in 'righteousness' (3:14, 5:6, 10:20, 6:1,33, 21:32) and 'righteous' (1:19, 10:41, 13:17,43,49, 20:4, 23:35, 25:37,46). It is clear that Matthew's use of justification or

condemnation based upon one's words has no connection with Paul's ideas. Usually Matthew's idea of righteousness is to keep the true law in a manner exceeding the Pharisees, i.e. in an inner attitude that is more important than any formal observance. (6:1) Jesus is represented as consenting to baptism to fulfill all righteousness. Righteousness is to be sought after (5:6) and it will be the occasion of persecution. It is the primary goal of life (6:33). John came in the way of righteousness (21:32). Thus righteousness, while a favored word for Matthew, is more akin to morality though based upon true principles of religion. There is a recognition of the law which is summed up in loving God and neighbor (22:40). Men are righteous in their service for others which is done for Christ's sake (Mt. 10: 42, 18:5) and in order that God may be glorified (5:16). This type of righteousness while akin to Paul's ethically is not related at all to his theories of Justification (Rom. 3:21-6).

SACRIFICE AND FORGIVENESS Matthew[1] alone of the gospels makes the connection of the forgiveness of sins and the blood or death of Christ (20:28, 26:28). Paul makes the same specific reference, God set forth Jesus to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. (Rom.3:24). (Eph. 1:7) "In whom we have our redemption through his blood." "Being

---

1. Cf. 27:25 "His blood be on us and on our children" may carry a double meaning.

justified in his blood" (Rom.5:9). "Having made peace through the blood of the cross" (Col.1:20 Cf. 1:22, Eph. 2:13). Neither Matthew nor Paul explain how Jesus' death effected remission of sins and resurrection unto righteousness. Paul's idea of Jesus' physical death which provided an escape from sin seems to be based upon the thought that temptation came to men through the flesh (Rom.7:23, 8:7, Gal.5:17).[1] The escape from sin was by the escape from flesh. Christ, in dying upon the cross, ceased to have further contact with sin, such as his fleshly existence had entailed, and since sin had no hold upon his spirit, he was delivered, from sin. Likewise men through union with him in his death and resurrection, could attain deliverance. With the familiar Jewish idea of social solidarity it may be that Paul appears to have thought of Christ as the representative of humanity -- a second Adam. The repeated references to forgiveness and blood, especially Rom. 3:24, have occasioned much discussion. There have been attempts to explain Paul's meaning by referring to Old Testament sacrifices and also to a mystical idea of blood. Both are unsatisfactory. It is necessary to remember that Jesus' death was central in Paul's thinking but it is related to all the rest of Jesus' life. Through Jesus' death on the Cross there was revealed a way for remission of sins. Man

---

1. Wade, N.T. History, 652f.

is thus in a position where he is forgiven. He has a status of righteousness. The blood or death of Jesus makes such a situation possible, because such a sacrifice illustrates God's eternally redeeming attitude. Scott sums up Paul's thought about Jesus' sacrifice.[1] (here abbreviated)

1. It was a sacrifice on our behalf.
2. It was a sacrifice on account of our sins.
3. It was a sacrifice the purpose and result of which was to restore or establish a relation of amity, love, sonship between men and God; it achieved that by commending to them his love, by drawing men to Christ and so to God; it was a means or instrument of reconciliation.
4. It was a necessary sacrifice because without it men could not have secured emancipation from the evil forces which held them down, or the restoration of a right relation to God, or been moved to believe in and accept the forgiving love of a Holy God and so to find that Life which vanquishes death in all its forms.
5. It was a sacrifice in accordance with the mind and will of God; it gave effect to his purpose.
6. It was a sacrifice in which Christ appeared and acted as a representative, and that in a two-fold aspect. He represented God to man. "God was in Christ". But

---

1. Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 92-94; Cf. Sanday and Headlam. Rom. 91-94.

Christ also represented God to man...as the head of a new humanity.[1]

7. The feature in the sacrifice of Christ to which Paul does give special prominence and significance is his obedience (2 Cor.10:5; Phil.2:8; Rom.5:13-18). Sin came through disobedience (Adam) so righteousness came through obedience (Christ - or Second Adam).

FAITH Since in Christ a new method of obtaining righteousness (Rom.3:21) is revealed and it is bestowed through God's grace,(i.e. Sheer kindness on God's part; unmerited on man's part) then there remains some response on man's part in order to secure God's favors. This desire and acceptance is what Paul calls faith (πίστις). It means more than intellectual assent (Jas.2:19). It is more than sterile acquittal of sin. It means a whole hearted acceptance both religiously and ethically of God's grace in Jesus Christ (Rom.1:17; Rom.3:21,22,26; Gal.3:26; Phil.3:9; Eph.2:8). The faith is directed both to God (Rom.4:5; 4:24; Rom.10:9) and to Jesus. (Gal.2:16; Phil.1:29). It results in a union of will and purpose and there is a strong basis of love between believer and the object of faith. Paul's idea of faith is summed up by Hatch as follows:[2] "Faith, regarded as the acceptance of the word of God or Christ, is the convert's

---

1. Hatch, Idea of Faith in Christian Literature. 6.
2. The Pauline Idea of Faith, 65.

response to the gospel message under the influence of a divine power working in and through the missionaries and hence faith is of divine origin. It is given to each individual by God in such measure as he wills. Faith is at once belief, trust and loyalty - the means whereby the believer receives the Spirit, and enters into and continues in mystical fellowship with Christ. Indeed it is itself the mystical state in which the Christian lives, and to it are due his spiritual blessings and the virtues which are characteristic of his life. Thus far the Apostle's faith is the basic principle of religion and the source of moral excellence."

In Matthew there are both similarities and differences in regard to the Pauline position. In Matthew faith often refers to belief in Jesus' ability to heal or work a miracle (8:10; 8:25; 9:2; 9:22,29; 14:32; 13:58; 15:28; 16:8; 17:20.) Such faith is indispensable for obtaining help and where faith was lacking he could do no mighty work. "It is not to be confused with the religious man's trust in God."[1] Belief in Jesus himself occurs in two passages (Mt.18:6; 27: 42). In the first passage "little ones that believe in me" are mentioned. This is a reflection of the early Christian faith which quickly grew up about Jesus. "To what extent Paul influenced early Christian usage of the words πιστεύω and πίστις and the idea of faith associated with them; to

---

1. Hatch, Idea of Faith in Christian Literature, 6.

what extent he was himself influenced by earlier Christian thought it is not easy to determine accurately. In the Synoptic gospels, aside from a single instance which by its exceptional use of Pauline phraseology (Mt. 18:6, editorial modification of the source) betrays an influence of Pauline usage, the conception of faith is simple and relatively elementary."[1] Burton finds the main Synoptic ideas of faith to be a trust in God and a confidence in the willingness and ability of Jesus to do certain things, usually to heal sickness or rescue from danger, rarely to forgive sins. "It is never so used as to imply that faith in Jesus necessarily involved any formal definition of his person or mission."[2] In 27:42 there is a reference to a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. The mockers will believe in him if he will come down from the cross. Faith is also connected with the forgiveness of sins in the case of the paralytic. (9:2). In the case of unbelief in his own townsmen (13:57) the lack of faith appears to be in Jesus as a prophet according to his own words. Sufficient faith will move mountains (17:20). Like Paul, Matthew believes in faith in God though it is more a practical religious kind of faith, and not as speculative as Paul's. In Matthew faith is directly related to prayer; in Paul it is often connected with God's promises (Rom.4:20). Both have faith in Christ. Paul (Gal.2:16) sees a special

---

1. Burton, Galatians, 484-5.
2. Ibid, 485, Cf. Sanday and Headlam, Rom., 31-34.

freedom and a justification that come by faith in Christ and not by the Law. Faith in Christ issues "in a vital fellowship of the believer with Christ, by which Christ becomes the compelling and controlling force in the believer's moral life" (Gal.2:20, 5:6).[1] He identified this faith with the older, more primitive faith of Old Testament men like Abraham. These ideas are not peculiar to Paul but he laid unusual emphasis upon them and so influenced later Christian thought, especially in the direction of mystical union with Christ. In conclusion except for one passage (Mt.18:6) there does not appear to be any influence in Matthew of Pauline ideas about faith but this one passage reflects an attitude which is best explained as due to Pauline teaching.

A summary of soteriology indicates that Matthew and Paul both connect Jesus' death with forgiveness of sins. This is a primitive teaching which each had received. There is insufficient evidence to prove influence on this point but Matthew's stress can be well understood in the light of the strong Pauline thought. There is no theory of sinful flesh in Matthew, and but very little that can be called Christ-mysticism. There is no relation in the ideas of righteousness except such as may be found in the minds of believers in

---

1. Ibid, 484.

a common Christianity.[1] Both agree that Jesus' death is a sacrifice and give to his blood a special significance. There is a general agreement on faith in God and Christ but no indication of dependence except at one point where Pauline terminology appears to have influenced Matthew in the expression "believing in me." (18:6).

---

1. Weiss, J. Die Bedeutung des Paulus für den modernen Christen, Z.N.T.W. 1920,137. "Dass Gott sein Heil schenkt (δωρεάν), aus Liebe und gnade, nicht aus Gerechtigkeit, das ist der Kern der Rechtfertigungslehre...Damit haben wir eine der tiefsten, innern Übereinstimmungen entdeckt zwischen Paulus und Jesus die nur durch die Abweichung in der Terminologie verhüllt ist."

3. LAW

It is in regard to the Mosaic Law that Matthew is most frequently claimed to be anti-Pauline.[1] Both Matthew and Paul make decisive claims about the law. According to the former not one letter ("jot nor tittle") was to pass away. It is permanently valid (5:18).[2] Its permission of divorce still held good (5:32, 19:9). The distinction between clean and unclean meats was not abolished (15:20). The disciples were still to take two or three witnesses in case of trouble (18:16). The disciples are to pray that their flight in the great tribulation might not fall on the Sabbath (18:16). Matthew omits (Mk.2:27) "the Sabbath was made for man" because it probably seemed to him out of harmony with Old Testament regulations. To the man asking for life is given the answer, "keep the commandments" (19:17). "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all things therefore that they say unto you do and observe."[3] The Pharisees are condemned for making void the law (15:6). Jesus paid the temple tax (17:24). He commanded the leper to show himself to the priest (8:4).

Yet with this apparently narrow legalism Matthew

---

1. Cf. Holtzmann, N.T. Theol. I, 502. Mt. is a theologian for whom the Law presents an "aktuelles Problem" and he has adopted Pauline language to combat the dangers of the Pauline position.
2. Allen, (Art.) Matthew, D.C.G., II,144,148.
3. See note3,p.106.

presents Jesus as holding that the law and prophets were until John but a new era had been proclaimed (11:12, 9:17).[1] In summaries Jesus transcends the law (7:12, 22:31-40). He presents new standards such as the perfection of the heavenly Father (5:43-48) or "the will of my Father in heaven" (7:21, 12:50). He distinguishes the weightier matters of the law from the trivial ones (23:23). The ritual of the law is subordinate to the moral. A man should leave his sacrifice until reconciled to a brother (5:23). In the sermon on the mount Jesus successively criticized the sixth and seventh commandments and the law of perjury, of revenge and of treatment of enemies and neighbors. (5:21-48) His teaching was like new wine, and so not for old bottles or like a new garment (9:16-17). He did not keep the Sabbath nor the distinction in foods so as to meet the common requirements of the religious leaders of his day. (15:1-20) He predicted the temple destruction. (26:61; 24) He is greater than the temple (12:6). He claims to be free from its tax (17:25). It is to be noted however that most of his condemnations refer not to Mosaic law but to the scribal interpretations of the law. (15:3, 23:4,16,23) There is a strong anti-Pharisaic polemic throughout Matthew (3:9, 5:20, 6:2,5,16; 15:2,14,23). This is especially evident in his rewriting of Mark and Q as well as in his own work. The Pharisees are the "offspring of vipers," "hypocrites," "blind guides," "whited sepulchres."

---

1. Denney, (art.) Law, H.B.D., III, 73-83.

This marked antagonism is all the more striking in a gospel that is strongly Jewish in coloring. But if Matthew, the publican disciple, had anything to do with the early origin of the book, it may help explain the feeling against the Pharisees. (This gospel only mentions the name Matthew (9:9) in connection with his call, and modestly places him after Thomas whereas Mark and Luke put him before.) (Mt.10:3 - Mk.3:18 - Lk.6:15) It may also be that Matthew's ideal scribe who "bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old" (13:52) illustrates the two attitudes which this composite gospel often presents in perplexing form. His idea of keeping the law and yet superseding it is the attempt to hold the good in the old religion (Judaism) and to point out the fulfillment in Christ in the new religion (Christianity). Weiss believes "dass der Verfasser im Prinzip, in der Lehre auf dem Standpunkt der Schriftgelehrten stehen will; er ist ja, wie sein ganzes Werk zeigt, selbt ein Schriftkundiger, wenn auch andrer Art, als die Gegner Jesu."[1] Weiss also thinks that this fluctuating attitude toward the Law could only arise from an author who knew Judaism, the Diaspora and hellenistic Christianity. Jesus is the fulfillment of both prophecy and law. Not only Jesus' new words but the old words of the past are found in Christianity.

Paul's position in regard to the Law often made trouble for him. He held that the Law did not essentially save men and hence could not be applied to Gentile Christians as his Galatian

---

1. Das Urchristentum, 586-7.

letter proves. For Jews the Law had been a yoke of bondage. (Gal.5:1) God sent forth his son to redeem them that were under the Law (Gal.4:4-5) because a curse was upon those who did not keep it. (Gal.3:10) Christ came in the flesh under the Law and suffered death but triumphed over it and so delivered His people from its curse. So Christ was the end of the Law to all who believe in him. (Rom.10:4) Paul's "whole point against the Law is that it never intended to serve anything but a temporary purpose, to be our schoolmaster unto Christ."[1] It "was always an incident,as it were, not an essential or permanent part of the Jewish religion."[2] He "nowhere argues that the observance of the Law is wrong in itself; it is wrong only when it is observed as an essential to salvation."

But like Matthew, Paul takes more than one attitude towards the Law. It was of divine origin (Gal.3:19). "The law is holy and the commandment holy and just and good." (Rom. 7:12) "We know that the Law is spiritual" (I Cor.7:19). It had the form of knowledge and of truth (Rom.2:20). Moreover as a Jew he kept the Law when he was in Jerusalem.[3] (Acts 18: 18). "Do we then make the law of none-effect through faith? God forbid: nay we establish the law" (Rom.3:31). This does not fit well with Christ as the end of the Law. The inconsistency must be reconciled by the different meanings present in

---

1. Hamilton, The People of God, II, 57-58.
2. Ibid, 55.
3. Knox, St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem, 269,283.

Paul's mind as Scott maintains:[1] "That is the distinction between the Law as a system whereby men could secure righteousness by merit and the contents of the Law the Divine requirements as to character and conduct of men. In the former sense the Law had come to an end. In the latter sense it remained valid for Jews and Christians, though not valid in quite the same sense for both." In regard to the first point Weiss also states: "kein Fleish soll auf Grund von Gesetzwerken die Rechtfertigung erlangen; dies ist nicht der weg, den Gott mit der Menschheit vorhätte; er will, dass sie auf andre Weise zum Heile komme."[2] The Law had failed; though it had been a commandment unto life it had led to death (Rom. 7:10). It had been thought to provide life (Gal.3:11) but it had not made alive (Gal.3:21), it had led to sin and death (Rom.8:2; 2 Cor.3:7). It had been mediated to men through angels and Moses (Gal.3:19) but it was relative and transitory from the beginning (2 Cor.3:13, Rom.5:20) and God's promise to Abraham had been fulfilled in Christ. (Gal.3:16). The Law had caused men to think that by keeping its rules they would be saved but only by the grace of God revealed in Christ Jesus was salvation made possible.

Paul made no formal distinctions in his usage of the term Law but morally the Law was binding on all men (I Cor. 7: 19) while ceremonially only the Jew need keep it. It was an

---

1. Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 42f.
2. Das Urchristentum, 170.

advantage he had over the Gentile. It had helped reveal sin. (Rom.5:20) "I had not known sin except through the Law." (Rom.7:7) It had been a tutor to bring men to Christ (Gal.3:24). It had quickened man's sense of need and hence he had found salvation in Christ. The law had been a restraining, regulative force but had been unable to save men. But while the law had served good purposes it is plain that for Paul it does not have the former moral authority because in Christ was its end or fulfillment. "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ's. (Col.2:16-17) "Ye are not under law but under grace." (Rom.6:14)

Changing Ménégoz's summary in the first point Paul's special theory of Law may be stated in brief as follows: The Law was given (1) to increase the consciousness of sin or that sin might be shown to be sin, (2) to lead to faith (3) to conduct to Christ (4) to give life.[1]

Both Paul and Matthew have apparently conflicting

---

1. Le Péché et la Loi, 123, quoted by Stevens, Theology of N.T., 374. In an unusually able discussion of law, Burton (Gal. 455 - 460) gives a more general statement of the meanings of law (here abbreviated) (1) A single statute or principle, ethical, religious or civil (2) Divine law, the revealed will of God subdivided into (a) historic (b) general or abstract (c) legalistic (d) an ethical principle of love. (3) Legal books of O.T. (4) Law without reference to source (5) By metonymy, a force or tendency to produce action.

attitudes toward the Law, but their main tendencies are observable. Both held that the Law was very valuable in some respects but for Paul its ceremonial authority was no longer essential while for Matthew its requirements were still binding though Jesus was its fulfiller. Matthew cannot be accused of the anti-Paulinism, belief in which the Tubingen school fostered, and which still continues in changed form.[1] It is very doubtful that there is a polemic against the great Apostle in the words, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach so shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." (Mt.5:19) (Cf. I Cor.15:9) "For I am the least of the apostles that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God." There is a verbal similarity only. Matthew in his gospel clearly shows Jesus breaking the commandments (12:8) and immediately after in vs.20 states that righteousness must exceed the Pharisaic righteousness which observed all the commandments. More probably he stressed the essentiality of law keeping because inside the husk, in his opinion, was the true kernel of righteousness. Moreover, when Matthew wrote, the Pauline fight for freedom for Gentiles was past. Reville is correct in maintaining that "le premier évangile, dans son ensemble actuel, ne peut pas avoir été inspiré par un intérêt

---

1. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 585, thinks Mt.5:17-19 is best understood "als eine stillschweigende antithesis gegen das Wirken und die Lehre des Paulus." Cf. Holtzmann, N.T. Theol., 506f.

de parti judaeo-chrétien au conflit direct avec le paulinisme."[1] Likewise the explanation of the parable of the tares where destruction is threatened for those who do lawlessness (ἀνομία) (Mt.13:41) cannot be pressed against Paul for in spite of the slanders against him he did keep the Law and spoke against the lawless one (II Thess.2:8) though he insisted that the law did not have saving essence. The claim that Paul is to be identified with "that man" who causes stumbling (18:6) (σκανδάλων), (though Paul refers to a scandal of the cross), or that he is one of the "false prophets" (21:11-12) leading many astray, cannot be verified. "That man" is purely a generalized concept and the "false prophets" refer to those at the end of the age. The polemic against Paul falls to the ground when it is remembered that the gospels do not represent contending parties in the first era of the Church. "They belong to a phase of theological development in which the controversies which had previously agitated men's minds began to be modified, and tended toward reconciliation."[2] The authors took their material as it had been received largely uncolored and they wrote in some measure influenced by their surroundings. Thus Matthew presents more than one view of the Law, though his dominant one is favorable to it. The "enemy" (Mt.13:25-28) in the parable of tares cannot be claimed to be Paul for Matthew himself states that it is the devil

---

1. St. Matthew, 8.
2. Reuss, I, 321.

(13:39).[1] Nor can Paul be thought to be among those who say 'Lord, Lord' but are condemned (7:22-3). To see Paul and his workers as evil in the parable of the fish net is far fetched indeed! (13:47) Such attempts to find anti-Paulinism represent forced exegesis and if "tendency" must be found, Feine's position is nearer the truth. "Antipaulinische Tendenz hat des Evangelium ebensowenig wie eine speziell petrinische."[2]

There are some notable differences in Pauline and Matthean interpretations of the Law which show an outlook not at all related. Paul's stress on grace as antithetical to Law has no correspondence in Matthew. Paul interprets the Law from a Rabbinical standpoint. He knows the Traditions and uses them to illustrate his position but Matthew shows no such usage. In Matthew the law takes its origin from God (15:3). In Paul it comes from God, but through angels (Gal.3:19). In both, Moses is given a part in mediating the Law to the people. For Paul the letter killeth but for Matthew there is a value in the things that those teach who sit in the seat of Moses.[3] In Paul, Jesus brought the Law to an end but in Matthew he fulfilled it and added to it. He is the Messiah who is greater than the Law

---

1. Burkitt, (Gospel Hist.,189) Such identification is "absurd and fantastic." If the parable is assumed to come from Jesus, he could not have referred to Paul.
2. Theol. des. N.T., 417.
3. This interpretation assumes that Jesus did not speak ironically.

but still Matthew is a good Jew whereas Paul is willing to be all things to all men. Paul interprets Jesus' death as placing an end to the Law but Matthew, while he regards the death as a fulfillment of prophecy does not connect it with the Law. It appears therefore that Paul thinks of Jesus as submitting to the Law and through death overcoming it whereas Matthew sets Jesus forth as superior to the Law at all times. In Matthew eternal life is gained by keeping the commandments (19:17). But for Paul, had righteousness come through the Law then there would have been no need for Christ's death (Gal.3:11-14). These differences show plainly that Paul and Matthew do not see alike on the Law. There are some general similarities such as the exaltation of Christ to a position above the Law, and there are evidences that both believed in a universalism that passed Jewish legalism. In general it can be seen that they are on opposite sides of the wide circle of Christian thought but there is no anti-Paulinism in Matthew on this point. If there really had been anti-Paulinism in Matthew then the paradox that Harnack points out could hardly have been historically true. "The gospel which in contents and bias is farthest removed from the Hellenic spirit -- the gospel which is throughout occupied with sharp and detailed controversy with the unbelieving Jews of Palestine was soon seized upon by Greeks themselves as the gospel most to their minds because it answered the requirements of apologetics and of the controversy with Judaism --

in short, because of its theological and doctrinal character and its solemn, ceremonious style. Hence it followed that this gospel replaced Paulinism in the Gentile Church -- that is, in so far as this church went beyond universalism in the direction of distinctly Pauline doctrine, she interpreted St. Paul in accordance with St. Matthew. And yet this result is not so wonderful after all. Of course, if we grant the truth of the old theory that Paulinism is equivalent to Gentile Christianity, then it is all most perplexing. But as soon as we realize what Paulinism really was -- namely, the universalistic doctrine and dialectic of a Jewish Christian -- it becomes easily comprehensible that Paulinism should have been replaced by St. Matthew, the gospel which both in positive and negative qualities, both in aim and method, is much more nearly akin to it than are St. Mark and St. Luke. St. Paul was overshadowed by St. Matthew because of the dialectic, which very soon proved to be perilous, furthermore because with St. Paul the fulfillment of the Old Testament seemed to be overshadowed by his doctrine of the abrogation of the Law, and lastly because of the difficulty of reconciling the doctrine of the freedom of the will with his theology."[1] If there had been the strong anti-Paulinism that some modern scholars have found in Matthew it never would have succeeded to its place in the

---

1. Luke, the Physician, 167-9.

outer Gentile Church which was so strongly dominated by Pauline thinking. If one of the keynotes of Matthew is not the opposition of law and grace as in Paul but opposition of the Old and the New law[1] then it may be said that on law Paul and Matthew are notably different.

---

1. Burkitt, Gospel Hist., 188.

4. GOSPEL

Matthew has a sentence which he uses twice in almost identical words. "And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of diseases and all manner of sickness among the people" (4:23, 9:35, Cf. 24:14). There seems to be a distinction in the thought of the evangelist between the things Jesus said and those that he did.[1] He taught, he preached the gospel, and healed. Probably not all the teachings could be called good news (e.g.10:34-7). No doubt in later, sub-apostolic times gospel came to be applied both to the general contents of Jesus' preaching and to his life but earlier there is a distinction between the things he said and did. "The gospel of the kingdom" relates to the good tidings which he brought and the kingdom of heaven which he proclaimed. The gospel and the kingdom are not identical. The former is good news concerning the latter. The latter is set forth in many teachings such as the Sermon on the Mount and the parables. The gospel was good news for all, even publicans and sinners (Mt.21:31). It proclaimed a kingdom for all men, even for those from the east and the west (8:11). The gospel was expected by Jesus to be preached in the whole world (26:13) and there also the woman's anointing would be told. Before

---

1. Case, Jesus, 30-33, 90-94, 341, 393.

the end shall come "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations." (24:14). Matthew uses the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι once. (11:4) "The poor have good tidings preached to them."

These quotations from Matthew indicate a varying usage. To determine his meanings it may be well to look at the term in its historical setting and in Mark. "εὐαγγέλιον und εὐαγγέλια bedeutet ursprünglich den Lohn fur eine gute Botschaft."[1] "The word never became frequent in non-Christian usage in the sense of glad tidings."[2] Among primitive Christians the word was part of their common vocabulary and meant the glad tidings of the coming of the kingdom of God. "It was within the Christian community that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι first attained the position of a formula."[3] Mark uses "gospel" seven times. (It does not occur in Luke or John though Luke uses the verb twenty-five times.)[4] Mark refers to "gospel" as the gospel of God and of Jesus Christ and as good tidings near at hand. Matthew accepts Markan usage but limits and defines it as "the gospel of the kingdom," which is his own addition. "In the form in which Matthew gives it, the formula can and perhaps even must be understood in such a way that we are to think of the proclamation of the

---

1. Klosterman, Handbuch, Z.N.T., II,4. Cf. Harnack, Constitution and Law of the Church, 275-6.
2. Harnack, op.cit., 275.
3. Dalman, Words of Jesus, 103.
4. Harnack, op.cit., 278,289.

nature and content of the kingdom and this really corresponds to the significance which Matthew in his gospel attributes to the description of the nature of the kingdom (see the Beatitudes, the Sermon on the Mount)."[1] Hence Matthean usage indicates that he thought of the gospel as good news of the kingdom (i.e. of heaven or God) which in turn he describes especially in the sermon of the mount and the parables both as spiritual and universal and also in a sense eschatalogical and hence importantly demanding repentance of men.[2] Also the gospel was part of Jesus' special mission and it is distinguished from his teaching and healing. Moreover the preaching of the gospel was to be a worldwide process. Finally it is natural that Jesus, in Matthew's view, is regarded as the bringer of the gospel though that aspect is only implicit throughout. It is clear, however, that Matthew did not think of the appearance of the gospel apart from Jesus' life and teachings.

The use of "gospel" is abundant throughout Paul's letters. It is one of his marked characteristics. He uses εὐαγγέλιον sixty times and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι twenty times.[3] Whether he is building upon Jesus' own usage or not is a debated point but it is important to recognize that the term

---

1. Ibid, 287, Cf. Loisy, Les Evangiles Synoptiques,4.
2. Dalman, op.cit.,102.
3. Harnack, Const. and Law of the Church, 292; Schniewand (Die Begriffe Wort und Evangelium bei Paulus,64) gives a count of 56 times for "evangel" and 19 for "evangelize."

was a common one in the early church. "Es ist ein Austruck der Missionsprache."[1] "Der volle Strom der neuen universalen Religionsbewegung flutete bereits, als Paulus in die Arbeit eintrat, auch er ist zunachst von diesen Strom geträgen."[2] "Pour Paul, c'est la doctrine de la redemption par la mort et la résurrection de Jésus (I Cor.15:1-11). L'Apôtre dit, en ce sens "mon évangile" (Rom.2:16, 16:25), or "notre évangile" (I Thess.1:5, II Thess.2:14, II Cor.4:3), en le distinguant d'un "autre évangile", qui est celui des judaïsants (Gal.1:6, II Cor.11:4); il dit "l'évangile de Dieu" (Rom.1:1, 14:16, II Cor.11:7, I Thess.2:2,8,9) pour en designer l'auteur, et 'l'évangile du Christ' (Rom. 1:9, 15:19, I Cor.9:12, 2:12, 9:12, 10:14, Gal.1:7, Phil. 1:27, I Thess.3:2) pour en designer plutôt l'objet; 'l'évangile de l'incirconcision' et celui 'de la circoncision' pour en marquer les destinaires, Gal.2:7, Eph.1:13."[3] As Weiss points out the word "gospel" meant for Paul not only the <u>work</u> of preaching but the <u>content</u> as well,[4] though the distinction is not always sharply drawn and in a few places the meanings are interchangeable. It has sometimes been

---

1. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 537; Harnack, op.cit., 294.
2. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 93.
3. Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques, 3-4.
4. Das Urchristentum, 537. For the <u>work</u> he quotes: Rom.1:1,15, 16,19, I Cor.4:15, 9:12,14,18, II Cor.2:12, 8:18, Gal.1:7, Phil.1:5, 2:22, 4:3,15, I Thess.1:5, 3:2. For the <u>content</u>, Rom.1:9,16, 2:16, 10:16, 11:28, 16:25, I Cor.9:14, 23, 15:1, II Cor. 4:3,4, 9:13, 10:14, 11:4,7, Gal.1:6,7, 11, 2:2,5,14, Phil.1:7,12,17,27, Col.1:5,23, I Thess. 2:2,4,8,9, II Thess. 1:8, 2:14.

maintained, since Paul uses gospel of Christ so frequently, that his meaning is the narrower one of a gospel concerning Christ. This view is untenable although it is natural that Christ is an essential element in his idea of the gospel. Christ is the chief object of the Christian preaching but "the gospel can be named from God as the original author and sender of this message of salvation, and also from Christ as its first herald in the world."[1] The content of the word for Paul "is not something special but God's plan of salvation, contained in the Old Testament as a promise, and realized through Jesus Christ (in this connection the conception "kingdom of God" plays no part; although it is familiar to Paul, he never brought it into direct connection with the gospel."[2]) "We probably get nearer to the thought of Paul if we understand his gospel as a gospel of the kingdom of God, than if we take it exclusively as a gospel of Christ. Yet the apostle said neither the one nor the other."[3] This separation of gospel and kingdom in Paul is entirely unlike Matthew. In a single passage (Phil. 4: 15) εὐαγγέλιον means simply the Christian epoch. In summary of Paul's position it can be seen that in contrast to Matthew he especially exalts the term "gospel"; it was contained in

---

1. Zahn, Intro. to N.T., II, 377. Cf. Holtzmann, Einl. in das N.T., 341.
2. Harnack, Constitution and Law of the Church, 294, Cf. Schniewand's (op.cit., 71f.) excellent discussion.
3. Ibid, 294, (note).

the promises and realized in Jesus' death and resurrection, hence his great emphasis on the gospel of Christ. He unites the gospel and salvation. Faith in the gospel will save men. Like Matthew he distinguishes between the preaching and the content and uses the term for both meanings. While he does not unite the kingdom and gospel formally like Matthew it is evident that in the total sense they agree. To see a dependence of Matthew on Paul[1] because there is a kingdom of the Son (Mt.25:3 -- The Son of Man shall come in his glory -- sit on the throne of his glory) distinct from that of the Father (Col.1:13, "kingdom of the Son of his love," Cf. I Cor.15:24-25) is a mistaken interpretation because it over emphasizes a distinction of Father and Son that the early writers probably never knew. Matthew and Paul both present the gospel as members of the same faith. There is no sound evidence of Matthew's knowledge of Pauline ideas about the gospel except in its world wide missionary aspect. This attitude in Matthew, though it stands beside a narrower view which kept the preaching to Jews, indicates the broadening influence of Paul's gospel for every creature.

Directly related to this discussion is the use of λόγος. Matthew does not favor the term but uses it once as equivalent to the gospel: "The word of the kingdom" (13:19).

---

1. Piepenbring, The Historical Jesus, 57.

Again, in 24:35 "my words shall not pass away" indicates the importance attached to Jesus' teaching. Once he uses an equivalent term for Scripture -- "by every word (ῥῆμα) which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." There is one solemn warning about the use of idle words (12:36). "By thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Christ's word in casting out demons is singularly powerful (8:16), "he cast out the spirits with a word." In this connection the importance is not in Christ's word of authority, nor in the utterance which may condemn or justify a man nor in the reference to a word of Scripture, though all of these uses are in Matthew. The fact that the word is an equivalent to the gospel and that Jesus' teaching is unique -- these are the points to be observed in contrast with Paul, whose use is varied.[1] He equates gospel and word (I Thess.1:6, Gal.6:6, Col.4:3) and uses the word in an absolute sense not found in Matthew. The content of the word is the "mystery of Christ." (Col.4:3) Also Christ is the subject of the word. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly" (Col.3:16). In I Thess.2:13,31 the word means the general content of New Testament preaching. The "Word of God" is equivalent to his promised salvation (Rom.9:6). In I Cor.14:36 and I Thess.1:8 the "word of God" is the gospel as preached in the time of Paul. In Col.1:26

---

1. Cf. Schniewand, op.cit., 52-54.

the "word of God" is "the mystery that hath been hid for ages and generations", but which is "Christ in you". Paul emphasized the Christological element in the "Word of God." In contrast to Matthew's sole instance, he frequently uses the word with a genitive, e.g. (I Cor. 1:18) "the word of the cross"; (II Cor.2:17) "corrupting the word of God"; (II Cor. 5:19) "the word of reconciliation; (Col.1:25) "to fulfill the Word of God"; (Col.3:16) "the word of Christ"; (I Thess. 1:8) "the word of the Lord"; (I Thess.2:13) "the word of the message." This extended and varied Pauline usage coincides with Matthew's in using the word as equivalent to the gospel but the rich content of Paul which scarcely appears in Matthew makes it improbable that there was any influence at this point.

5. SACRAMENTS

A. BAPTISM The problem of baptism may be approached from different angles. There is Jewish baptism, John's Baptism, Jesus' baptism and early Christian baptism as reflected in Paul's and Matthew's unusual statement of baptism (28:19). The main purpose here is to investigate Paul and Matthew but a brief statement of other aspects must be considered. In regard to Jewish baptism while the word is not common,[1] the practice was well known and was mainly concerned with washings or lustrations. (Exod.19:10, Num.31:21-24). Moreover the prophets saw a spiritual symbolism of cleansing (Ezek.36:25-26, Zech.13:1, Ps.51:7).[2] There was also baptism for proselytes[3] which was a bath of cleansing before witnesses but it was not administered by a religious leader nor did it confer initiation. John's baptism signified moral cleansing and preparation for entrance as a member into the kingdom of heaven. "Josephus findet die Bedeutung des Johannes in zwie Dingen: er predigte Gerechtigkeit und Frommigkeit, und er taufte seine Hörer."[4] Josephus underlined the Levitical character of John's baptism but denied the pardon of sins of which the baptism was a

---

1. Foakes-Jackson & Lake, Beg. of Christianity, I, 334.
2. Windisch, Taufe und Sünde, 45f; Clow, Church and Sacraments, 67f.
3. Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II,747; Abrahams, Pharisaism and the Gospels, 36f; Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 115.
4. Windisch, Taufe und Sünde, 74.

sign (Antiq.XVIII V,2). Christian baptism carried the idea of remission of sin and acquirement of righteousness with one notable addition that is distinctive of Christianity, i.e. baptism in or into the name of Christ. "Uranfänglich war die christliche Taufe nichts anderes als die johanneische Taufe, nur dass die jetzt im namen Jesu vollzogen würde."[1] John had foretold One to come who would baptize not with water only but with the Holy Spirit and fire. When Jesus came to him for baptism John, according to Matthew, demurs because of unworthiness. This emphasizes the superiority of Jesus. Matthew also omits the reference to John's preaching a repentance unto remission of sins (Mk. 1:4; cf. Mt.3:2). This was probably intended to obviate any difficulties about Jesus' baptism being for sin. In connection with Jesus' baptism there came to him the Spirit of God.

The main point in this discussion centers around the only reference (Mk.16:15-16 is not genuine) found in the gospels where Jesus commands baptism. "No other text has counted so much in the dogmatic development of the church as the text at the end of Matthew 28:19."[2] The question of the authenticity of this passage has been vigorously debated. Conybeare has held that it is not a part of the original

---

1. Seeberg, Die Taufe im N.T., 18.
2. Conybeare, Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels. Hib. Jour., I, 1,102. (Oct.1902)

Matthew. He based his view largely upon Eusebian quotations.[1a] He has been strongly criticized by Riggenbach[1] and Chase,[2] who maintain the integrity of the text and the genuineness of the saying as from Jesus. The latter appear to have the better argument, but the truth probably lies between. This is not the place for source analysis but it appears that Matthew's text is sound[3] and that the command is due to him, rather than Jesus, though it is probable that Jesus gave some command about baptism during his ministry. The Fourth Gospel states that his disciples baptized (4:1-2). The fact of an early and universal use of the rite in church indicates the authority of Jesus who by his example in submitting to baptism gave weight to the custom even if he did not verbally command it. It is best in view of the unusual passage, to hold that Matthew "does not here report the ipsissima verba of Jesus but transfers to him the familiar language of the church of the Evangelist's own time and locality."[4] The baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is thus accounted for because the command appears strange on Jesus' lips but

---

1a. Ibid, 96-113, and The Eusebian Form of the Text, Mt.28:19, Z.N.T.W. (1901) 275f.
1. Riggenbach, Der Trinitarische Taufbefehl.
2. The Lord's Command to Baptize, J.T.S. VI, 24, 481-519. July, 1905.
3. Harnack, Constitution and Law of the Church, 259f, maintains that the Trinitarian formula had its rise in Palestine 50-80 A.D.
4. Robinson, Ency. Bib. I, 474.

not so, as interpretation of the truths he lived and taught. There are other references to Father, Son and Spirit in the New Testament (II Thess.2:13, I Cor.12:4, II Cor.13:14, Eph. 2:18, 3:14, 4:3). These come from Paul but there are others (I Pet.1:2, Rev.1:4, I Jo.3:23, 4:2, Heb.6:4, Jude 20).[1] The baptism "into the name of" is made plain from Old Testament usage[2] where the use of "the name" denotes everything by which an individual or God is known and baptism into the name of Father, Son and Spirit means that the baptized person is placed in a position of religious dependence and possession. There is no magical formula invoked here but rather the proclamation of an ethical and religious relation.

In Paul's letters there is less reference to baptism than one would expect, e.g. there is no mention of baptism in the Thessalonian letters.[3] This would seem to indicate that baptism was not an essential point in his thought. "I thank God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name," "Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel" (I Cor.1:15,17). It is clear that baptism is subordinate to preaching in his thought. In this Corinthian passage Paul's main thought is that "baptism 'in the

---

1. Chase, J.T.S., VI,24,510; Feine, Theologie des N.T., 152.
2. Heitmüller, Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum, 12.
3. Clow, The Church and Sacraments, 105, thinks the list of allusions of Paul to baptism would be "surprisingly large" but he does not give them.

name of Christ' placed a seal upon the fact that the person baptized belonged to Christ; he belonged to him by faith."[1] In Rom.6:3-4 and Col.2:12 the believer was buried with Christ through baptism into death and was raised to newness of life. In Gal.3:27 the believers are told that "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (I Cor. 12:13) "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body." (Cf. Eph.4:24, Col.3:10, Rom.13:14) There are also two allusions to baptism as a cleansing.[2] Christ gave himself for the church "having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word" (Eph.5:26.) In I Cor.6:11 Paul traces back the steps from baptism to the beginning or its source. "Ye were washed, (or washed yourselves clean, middle voice, i.e. it was by their own will), but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." These passages from Paul indicate that baptism meant (1) a sign or seal of having passed under the authority of Christ (2) a representation of Christ's death and hence a dying to sin and a rising to new life in the Spirit[3] (3) an incorporation into the one body of redeemed

---

1. Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 117.
2. Ibid, 119f.
3. Easton (The Pauline Theol. & Hellenism, Amer. Jour. Theol. XXI,3,373) thinks that the doctrine of baptism which was connected with Christ's death is due to mystery-religion influence upon Paul, though there is some evidence of baptism as a burial in the Jewish proselyte baptism before Paul's day, but the idea was not essentially Jewish (Cf. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 125).

humanity (4) a cleansing sign for those who were baptized (Cf. I Cor.1:21) (5) In addition there is a passage I Cor. 10:1-5 where baptism for all "unto Moses" indicates that there are spiritual blessings provided for all and failure to live up to them meant dire consequences. (6) There were some people at Corinth who were "baptized for the dead" (I Cor.15:29). This probably means a vicarious baptism for those who had reached faith in Christ but had not been baptized before death. This last reference indicates a semi-magical or superstitious custom of the Corinthians but Paul does not commit himself as approving it. He uses it as an example in his resurrection argument. Heitmüller gives a sweeping summary of Paul's ideas of baptism.[1] "Errettung aus der Macht der Finsternis und Versetzung in das Reich Gottes, Abwaschung der Sünden, Gerechtmachung, Weihung an Gott, Heiligung, Mitteilung des göttlichen Geistes, Eigentum Christi, innigste Vereinigung mit Christus, Versenkung in ihn, Christus auziehen, mit ihn gestorben und auferweckt sein - es ist eine Fülle von Bildern, mit denen Paulus die Wirkung der Taufe beschreibt." The distinctively Pauline thought is to be found in mystically united life with the heavenly Christ.[2]

There is a strong trend of modern thought which regards Paul's baptismal position not as merely symbolical

---

1. Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum, 18.
2. Feine, Theol.des N.T., 313,also has a quite similar summary.

but as sacramental. "Die Taufe ist für Paulus ein Sacrament, d.h. die mit ihr verknüpften religiösen Güter werden durch sie vermittelt und gewirkt."[1] "It was Paul who first created the conception of a sacrament; any external acts... are turned into sacraments as soon as they are esteemed to be means of salvation. They are thereby stamped as something different from what they really are: the element of mystery and the miraculous takes possession of them, they come to be the instruments of divine power."[2] The arguments for baptism as a symbol or a sacrament are well summarized by Forsyth:[3] They do not need to be given here. It appears that in a great thinker like Paul there are various aspects whose seeming antinomies never were clearly articulated into a strictly logical system. It is quite probable that Paul held something sacramental in baptism though not to the extent that the later church thought. The bulk of his teaching clearly indicates that salvation is not dependent on a form like baptism but in his instructions to converts he points out the religious importance of ceremonial acts

---

1. Heitmuller, Taufe und Abendmahl, 18.
2. Wernle, Beg.of Christianity I,273; Cf.Pfleiderer, Prim. Christianity, I, 387; Lake, Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, 385; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 128; Feine, Theol. des N.T., 315.
3. The Church and Sacraments, 145-150; Scott, The Fellowship of the Spirit,152, "Those who insist that Christianity had become a sacramental religion have to show why the subject of the sacraments claims so small a share of attention in the Christian documents, and indeed is ignored in so many of them."

and hence provided some material support for a spiritual experience. His stress on the faith which saved a man is greater than the means or rite of which the faith is expressed. In general, it may be held that baptism was a sign or seal, helpful but not indispensable, "put upon the act of faith appropriating the gift of God in Christ."[1] "Baptism does not bring about communion with Christ but seals it."[2] "Doubtless the Apostle would have scorned the idea that any spiritual result could be obtained by outward rites alone, without faith. Though in excellence surpassed by love, faith is essential. But that is not the question. The question is how far the outward rite is essential to the effectual working of faith, or, how faith works in relation to baptism, and baptism in relation to faith. Beyond connecting both with the name and power of the risen Lord, St. Paul does not explain. From the actual contents of his letters, I do not think we can go beyond this point."[3]

The Matthean accounts of baptism are historical except 28:19 where the beliefs of the early church are expressed.[4] The exact triune baptismal formula is not Pauline.

---

1. Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 114.
2. Deissmann, Paul, 145.
3. Bezzant, J.S., Modern Churchman, XVI, 6,7,8, 349-350.
4. Findlay (Jesus in the First Gospel, 314) states that since "Paul slips in the Trinitarian formula so casually and by no means as if he was introducing something new" the expression was already in use perhaps in the liturgy of the church and is based on some tradition of the words of Jesus.

He knows baptism into the name of Jesus. His general attitude toward baptism may be called doctrinal and in that sense, the ideas in Mt.28:19 are like Paul's, but the expression "I am with you" is different from "Christ in you." On the other hand, the universality of the command, the mention of the Trinity, the idea of Christ's mystical presence are all implicit in Paul's interpretation of the gospel. There is no definite relation to Paul however, though the influences of his gospel emphases are apparent in the baptismal formula.

B. THE LORD'S SUPPER The Last Supper is one of the few places where a direct comparison may be made between Matthew and Paul. The latter states (I Cor.11:23) that he received his knowledge from the Lord, i.e. as the ultimate source. His account is not a formal history but is introduced incidentally to aid him in correcting abuses which had sprung up in the Corinthian church. The following outline will set forth the two accounts: (See following page.)

The similarities of the accounts are evident. The passages underlined, "unto remission of sins" and "with you" are peculiar to Matthew. The chief differences are that Paul has (1) the injunction "this do in remembrance of me". "Even Matthew, whom from his general tendencies, otherwise known, we should most expect to do so adds no word suggesting a

Paul I Cor.11:23-26	Matthew 26:26-30
In the night in which he was betrayed	And as they were eating
the Lord Jesus	Jesus
took bread and when he had given thanks	took bread and blessed
he brake it	and brake it and he gave to the disciples
and said	and said, Take eat
this is my body which is for you	This is my body
this do in remembrance of me	
In like manner also the cup after supper	and he took a cup and gave to them,
saying	saying, drink ye all of it;
This cup is the new covenant in my blood	for this is my blood of the covenant
	which is poured out for many unto remission of sins
This do as often as ye drink it in remembrance of me	
	But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom.
For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.	

permanent ecclesiastical rite."[1] (2) "New" covenant, (3) The cup is taken after supper, (4) the supper is a proclamation of the Lord's death until his return which in Matthew is intimated in Jesus' reference to drinking "with you in my Father's kingdom." (5) There is no reference in Paul to the Passover celebration. (6) There is a different word in Paul in reference to the blessing, εὐχαριστήσας, while Matthew has εὐλογήσας. It has been customary to see a Mark-Matthew tradition and a Paul-Luke one.[2] Weiss thinks there are three lines: Paul, Mark and Luke in which there is not much difference in Matthew and Mark, while Paul and Mark show no influence.[3] But Matthew varies from Mark in the reference to "remission of sins" and in the addition of "with you." Moreover where Mark has "Take" and omits any command to drink, Matthew has the command "Take, eat" and "Drink ye all of it." In view of Paul's many references to eating and drinking (I Cor.10:3,4,7,17,21, 11:20,26-34, 23:25) there may be some weight to Holtzmann's suggestion that there may be some relation between Matthew and Paul.[4] And it is clear that Matthew viewed the supper in a distinctly sacrificial light.[5] The expression "with you" may also be

---

1. White, The Mod. Churchman, XVI,6,7,8,331.
2. Clow, The Church and Sacraments, 160f.
3. Das Urchristentum, 504f.
4. Das Abendmahl, Z.N.T.W., (1904), V,92.
5. Thayer, Recent Discussions respecting the Lord's Supper, J.B.L. XVIII, (1899), 114.

permanent ecclesiastical rite."[1] (2) "New" covenant, (3) the cup is taken after supper, (4) the supper is a proclamation of the Lord's death until his return which in Matthew is intimated in Jesus' reference to drinking "with you in my Father's kingdom." (5) There is no reference in Paul to the Passover celebration. (6) There is a different word in Paul in reference to the blessing, [illegible] while Matthew uses [illegible]. It has been customary to see a Mark-Matthew tradition and a Paul-Luke one.[2] Weiss thinks there are three lines: Paul, Mark and Luke in which there is not much difference in Matthew and Mark, while Paul and Mark show no influence.[3] But Matthew varies from Mark in the reference to "remission of sins" and in the addition of "with you." Moreover where Mark has "Take" and omits any command to drink, Matthew has the command "Take, eat" and "Drink ye all of it."[4] In view of Paul's many references to eating and drinking (1 Cor. 10:3,4,7,17,21, 11:20,26-34, 22:20) there may be some weight to Jülicher's suggestion that there may be some relation between Matthew and Paul.[5] And it is clear that Matthew viewed the supper in a distinctly sacrificial light.[6] The expression "with you" may also be

---

1. White, The Mod. Churchman, XVI,6,7,8,324.
2. Clow, The Church and Sacraments, 1908.
3. Das Urchristentum, 3044.
4. Das Abendmahl, E.N.T., (1902), V,95.
5. Mayer, Recent Discussions respecting the Lord's Supper, J.R.L. XVIII, (1899), 114.

understood as an emphasis upon the communion of Christ with his followers.[1] These points look toward a knowledge of Pauline teaching though the differences in the accounts forbid any literary dependence. "The words of Jesus at the Last Supper are given distinctly mediatorial reference by Matthew (26:28). Just how far this insistence on the vicarious nature of the death of Jesus was due to the influence of Paul must always be a matter of discussion, but the antecedent probability of such influence is considerable....At the same time it would be a mistake to hold that every such similarity between the evangelist's interpretation of the death of Jesus and that of Paul was due to the direct or indirect influence of the latter."[2] It must be added that there is an eschatological aspect to the future sharing of Jesus with his disciples (Mt.26:30) but Paul has something of the same thought in continuing the rite until the Lord comes.

It is doubtful whether McGiffert's contention is valid. He holds that whenever the disciples ate together it was the Lord's Supper but that Paul had made it a special meal and separated it from the other meals.[3] But it is possible that there was an idea of fellowship in the breaking of bread (Cf. Lk.24:35 Acts 2:42) that prevailed before the Last Supper had come to have special significance. Weiss

---

1. McNeile, St. Matthew, 383.
2. Mathews, Mess. Hope in the N.T., 232.
3. Apostolic Age, 69f, 558.

understood as an emphasis upon the communion of Christ with his followers.[1] These points look toward a knowledge of Pauline teaching though the differences in the accounts give no bid any literary dependence. The words of Jesus at the last Supper are given distinctly messianic reference by Matthew (26:29). Just how far this insistence on the eschatic nature of the death of Jesus was due to the influence of Paul must always be a matter of discussion, but the entire probability of such influence is considerable.....At the same time it would be a mistake to hold that every such similarity between the evangelist's interpretation of the death of Jesus and that of Paul was due to the direct or indirect influence of the latter.[2] It must be added that there is an eschatological aspect to the future sharing of Jesus with his disciples (Mt. 26:29) but Paul was something of the same thought in continuing the rite until the Lord comes.

It is doubtful whether Moffatt's contention is valid. We hold that whenever the disciples ate together it was the Lord's Supper but that Paul had made it a special meal and separated it from the other meals.[3] But it is probable that there was an issue of fellowship in the breaking of bread (Cf. Lk. 24:35 Acts 2:42) that prevailed before the last Supper had come to have special significance. Weiss

---

1. Goodsie, St. Matthew, 363.
2. Mathews, Soc. Hope in the N.T., 232.
3. Apostolic Age, 287, 288.

thinks that the breaking of bread was not in the beginning a celebration of the death of Jesus.[1] If so there is a corresponding idea in Paul's unique passage: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion (participation or partnership) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not a communion of the body of Christ, seeing that we, who are many, are one bread (loaf) one body; for we all are parts of the one bread." (I Cor. 10:16f)[2] Paul's reference here to the Eucharist is intended to illustrate his idea of the fellowship or incorporation in Christ, which will be dealt with in a following section. He uses the Eucharist as a warning for men to examine themselves lest in eating and drinking they bring judgment upon themselves. They must have a proper sense of the body and blood of Christ. Scott points out that this lack of fitness in a man has a striking parallel in Matthew's parable of the man at a wedding feast without a garment.[3]

Paul's warning about the lack of respect for the Supper was given point by his statement that physical consequences such as sickness and death, had befallen the Corinthians (I Cor.11:30). This unusual view presents a

---

1. Das Urchristentum, 84.
2. In this passage Paul places the Cup first and the Bread second, which is the reverse order in his fuller account (11:23f). No fully satisfactory explanation is known for the transposition, perhaps there was an instinctive desire to assimilate the order to the Passover meal. Cf. Scott, Fellowship of the Spirit, 152.
3. Christianity acc. to St. Paul, 190.

thinks that the wrecking of brand-new not in the beginning a celebration of the death of Jesus.[1] If so there is a corresponding idea in Paul's unique passage: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion (participation or partnership) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread (loaf) one body for we all are partic of the one bread." (I Cor. 10:16)[2] Paul's reference here to the Lord-Christ is intended to illustrate his idea of the fellowship or incorporation in Christ which will be dealt with in a following section. He uses the Lord-Christ as a warning for men to examine themselves lest in eating and drinking they bring judgment upon themselves. They must have a proper sense of the body and blood of Christ. Scott points out that this lack of fairness in a man has a striking parallel in Christ's parable of the man at a wedding feast without a garment.[3]

Paul's warning about the lack of respect for the Lord-Christ was given point by his statement that physical consequences such as sickness and death, had befallen the Corinthians (I Cor. 11:30). This communal view presents a

---

1. Das Urchristentum, 84.
2. In this passage Paul places the cup first and the bread second. Which is the correct order in the Lord's supper (11:23)? No fully satisfactory explanation is known for the transposition. Perhaps there was an instinctive desire to assimilate the other to the Passover meal.
3. Christianity According to St. Paul, 100.

problem but it is possible that he wished to make his warning emphatic and that divine punishment followed human impudence. He did not think of a magical sort of punishment.[1] Any attempt to read a magical meaning into Paul's sacramental conceptions is a mistake. "The Lord's Supper is not for him the real cause of communion with Christ but an expression of that communion. It is a peculiarly intimate contact with the Lord. The Lord's Supper does not bring about communion, it only brings it into prominence. Neither the baptism nor the Lord's Supper is regarded as of magical effect. (Cf. I Cor.10:1-12) This passage is simply decisive that Paul did not hold magical ideas."[2] The fundamental ideas in Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper are (1) proclamation of the death of Christ and the appropriation of the blessings of his death in the partaking of the Supper (2) eating and drinking with the Holy Spirit and of the spiritual body and blood of Christ (3) a meal of a communal form in which the Christians were bound together into a corporation of the body of Christ.[3] But this summary of Feine's does not take into account the covenantal idea (Cf. Jer. 31:31-33, Ex. 24:6f). When these ideas are compared with Matthew's it can be seen that they cover much the same ground as might be expected when both

---

1. Feine, Theol. des N.T., 316.
2. Deissmann,op.cit. 145 (and note).
3. Ibid, 319.

problem but it is possible that he wished to make his warning emphatic and that divine punishment followed human impudence. He did not think of a magical sort of punishment.[1] Any attempt to read a magical meaning into Paul's sacramental conceptions is a mistake. "The Lord's Supper is not for him the real cause of communion with Christ but an expression of that communion. It is a peculiarly intimate contact with the Lord. The Lord's Supper does not bring about communion, it only brings it into prominence. Neither the baptism nor the Lord's Supper is regarded as of magical effect. (Cf. I Cor.10:1-12) This passage is simply declare that Paul did not hold magical ideas."[2] The fundamental ideas in Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper are (1) proclamation of the death of Christ and the appropriation of the blessings of his death in the partaking of the Supper (2) eating and drinking with the Holy Spirit and of the spiritual body and blood of Christ (3) a meal of a communal form in which the Christians were bound together into a corporation of the body of Christ.[3] But this summary of Feine's does not take into account the covenantal idea (Cf. Jer. 31:31-33, Ex. 24:8). When these ideas are compared with Matthew's it can be seen that they cover much the same ground as might be expected when both

---

1. Feine, Theol. des N.T., 314.
2. Deissmann, op.cit. 145, (and note).
3. Ibid. 315.

writers deal with material which had been handed down. In Matthew's interest in the sacrificial aspect of the Last Supper and his emphasis on eating and drinking and his thought of Christ's presence "with you" there may be reflections of Pauline ideas. This evidence however is not definitely certain but taken cumulatively the possibility is present. More definite claim of Pauline influence cannot be made although Loisy attempts it.[1]

---

1. Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques, I, 194, "L'idée du Christ pre-existant n'est pas expressément formulée ni même insinuée dans les Évangiles synoptiques. On a pu voir neanmoins que le théorie paulinienne de la redemption y a penétré, et qu'elle a même exercé un influence considérable sur la mise en oeuvre des souvenirs apostoliques, principalement dans le récit de la dernière cène."

6. KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, CHURCH, LIFE AND κοινωνία

The kingdom and the church both appear in Paul and Matthew. "Kingdom of God" appears in Matthew four times (12:28, 19:24, 21:31,43). The last reference is unique. It refers to the community of Israel. "Kingdom of heaven" occurs thirty-two times.[1] "The Kingdom" appears six times (4:23, 8:12, 9:35, 12:19,38, 24:14). "Thy Kingdom" (of God) is in 6:10, of Jesus (20:21). "His Kingdom" (of God) is found in 6:33, (Of the Messiah) in 13:41, 16:28. "The Kingdom of their Father" appears in 13:43, 26:29. Matthew's use of heaven instead of God is probably because heaven is a Jewish periphrasis for God.[2] Or it may be due to the Evangelist's desire to emphasize the contrast between heaven and earth.[3] The chief idea is doubtless the sovereignty of God. The kingdom was (1) immanent and spiritual in nature and moral qualities were essential in its citizenry. It was an ideal community. (2) It was also transcendent. It was come "among you" (12:28) but it was also coming in the future in an eschatological sense.[4] It was a reward. (3) It was an actual society with both good and bad as the

---

1. McNeile, St. Matthew, XIX,f.
2. Dalman, Words of Jesus, 206f, Feine, Theol. des N.T.,21, Pfleiderer, Prim. Christianity, II, 396.
3. McNeile, St. Matthew, XXIII.
4. Montefiore, (Syn.Gosp.,II,33-34) states that out of 48 passages where the kingdom is referred to, 26 refer to the future.

4. KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, CHURCH, LIFE AND [illegible]

The Kingdom and the church both appear in Paul and Matthew. "Kingdom of God" appears in Matthew four times (13:24, 19:24, 21:31,43). The last reference is unique. It refers to the community of Israel. "Kingdom of Heaven" occurs thirty-two times.[1] "The Kingdom" appears six times (4:23, 9:35, 13:19,38, 24:14). "The Kingdom" (of God) is in 6:10, 7 times (20:21). "His Kingdom" (of God) is found in 6:33, (of the Messiah) in 13:41, 16:28. "The Kingdom of their Father" appears in 13:43, 26:29. Matthew's use of heaven instead of God is probably because heaven is a Jewish periphrasis for God.[2] Or it may be due to the Evangelist's desire to emphasize the contrast between heaven and earth.[3] The social idea is combined the authority of God. The kingdom was (1) transcent and spiritual in nature and moral qualities were essential in its citizenship. It was an ideal community. (2) It was also transcendent. It was come "among you" (12:28) but it was also coming in the future in an eschatological sense.[4] It was a remote. (3) It was an actual society with both good and bad as the

---

1. Moffatt, St. Matthew, xxxi.
2. Bultman, Forms of Gospel, 2001, Reine, Theol. see N.T., 21.
3. Schlatter, Jesus, Christlichkeit, 11, 280.
4. Moffatt, St. Matthew, xxxii.
5. Montefiore, (Syn. Gos., ii,20-26) states that out of 42 passages where the Kingdom is referred to, 26 refer to the future.

parables of the net and the tares show. (4) Entering the Kingdom was equivalent to life. Everything was to be sacrificed to gain life. It is evident that Matthew in a peculiar sense regarded church and kingdom as related. It can hardly be maintained that the church and kingdom are equivalent in his thought[1] but Jesus is represented as promising to build his church and to give to Peter keys to the kingdom for binding and loosing. It is probable that the church is the actual earthly society and the kingdom is a larger more inclusive concept. Several of Matthew's parables point to the kingdom as like the church. The net, the tares, the wedding feast, the reference to John the Baptist and the least in the kingdom are best understood when the idea of the church is recognized to be present in the writer's mind.

Matthew has one other reference to the church (18: 17) where the procedure in case of brotherly sin is outlined. These are the only references to the church in Matthew or the other gospels.

The exact meaning of ἐκκλησία in the mind of the writer is not easy to determine. It is evident that the term,

---

1. Foakes-Jackson & Lake, Beg. Christianity, I, 331, who follow Wellhausen, Einleitung, 105f. Cf. Montefiore op.cit.34. "There are a number of passages in which the kingdom seems to be present and identified with the Christian community or church" (Cf.11:11, 13:19, 24,31,33,38,41,47,52.)

parables of the net and the tares show. (4) Entering the Kingdom was equivalent to life. Everything was to be sacrificed to gain life. It is evident that Matthew in a peculiar sense regarded church and kingdom as related. It can hardly be maintained that the church and kingdom are equivalent in his thought[1] but Jesus is represented as promising to build His church and to give to Peter keys to the kingdom for binding and loosing. It is probable that the church is the social earthly society and the kingdom is a larger more inclusive concept. Several of Matthew's parables point to the kingdom as like the church. The net, the tares, the wedding feast, the reference to John the Baptist and the least in the kingdom are best understood when the idea of the church is recognized to be present in the writer's mind.

Matthew has one other reference to the church (18: 17) where the procedure in case of brotherly sin is outlined. These are the only references to the church in Matthew or the other gospels.

The exact meaning of [illegible] in the mind of the writer is not easy to determine. It is evident that the term

---

1. Peake-Johnson's Intro. Sec. Christianity, i, 224, who follow Feltmann, Einleitung, 1908. Cf. Montefiore op.cit.24. "There are a number of passages in which the kingdom seems to be present and identified with the Christian community or church" (Cf.16:11, 13:19, 24.31.33.38.41.47.52.)

which is common in both Greek and Old Testament usage (LXX), meant a called assembly primarily and for Greek speaking Jews it stood for the congregation of Israel though Hort feels there is much darkness about the meaning of the term for Jews in the time of the Christian era.[1] Harnack has pointed out that among the names used by the early Christians the term "church" was the happiest stroke which the primitive community accomplished in the way of descriptive titles."[2] It is probable that for Matthew the term denoted the followers of Jesus who were regarded as the true congregation of God, a usage of the term well known from Old Testament writings. It meant a society distinct from ordinary Jewish assemblies.[3] "As a new creation of God, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ , the community was conscious of having been chosen by God in Jesus before the foundation of the world. In the conviction of being the true Israel, it claimed for itself the whole historical development recorded in the Old Testament, convinced that all the divine activity there recorded had the new community in view."[4]

Matthew regards the church as a place where disputes can be taken and settled and also as an institution that had no less a divine builder than Jesus himself. It

---

1. Hort, The Christian Ecclesia.,6,7.
2. Constit. & Law of the Church, 15.
3. Burkitt, Gospel Hist., 191.
4. Harnack, Hist. of Dogma,I,88.

Bruce, is common in both Greek and Old Testament usage (LXX), meant a called assembly primarily and for Greek speaking Jews it stood for the congregation of Israel. Though most Jews there is much darkness about the meaning of the term for Jews in the time of the Christian era.[1] Harnack has pointed out that among the names used by the early Christians the term "church" was the happiest attempt which the primitive community accomplished in the way of descriptive titles.[2] It is probable that for Matthew the term denoted the followers of Jesus who were regarded as the true congregation of God, a usage of the term well known from Old Testament writings. It meant a society distinct from ordinary Jewish assemblies.[3] "As a new creation of God, a fellowship for God, the community was conscious of having been chosen by God in Jesus before the foundation of the world. In the conviction of being the true Israel, it claimed for itself the whole historical development recorded in the Old Testament, convinced that all the divine activity there recorded had the new community in view."[4]

Matthew regards the church as a place where disputes can be taken and settled and also as an institution that had no less a divine builder than Jesus himself. It

---

1. Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, 1.
2. Dunkit, A Law of the Church, 15.
3. Burkitt, Gospel Hist., 101.
4. Harnack, Hist. of Dogma, I, 90.

is generally agreed that the words here attributed to Jesus are a reflection of Apostolic history rather than an original saying, although McNeile thinks Jesus may well have used the term (ἐκκλησία) to describe his body of followers.[1] On the other hand many scholars feel that the idea of a church, an earthly institution, was foreign to Jesus' thought.[2] The probabilities in the case lie on the side against the use of the term by Jesus. The appearance of ἐκκλησία in Matthew is entirely understandable in view of his time and circumstances. "The gospel of Matthew was written as an apology against the objections and calumnies of the Jews, which were soon adopted by the Gentiles. This evangelist alone has a distinct interest in our Lord's teaching as such; he instructs, he proves, and all the while he keeps the church well in the foreground."[3] Matthew's references to the church appear but twice but its position powers and responsibilities are grounded in his mind. In the Petrine passage (16:17f) the church is founded on rock, it belongs to Christ ("my church") its permanence is greater than the gates of Hades, and Peter, as leader, had extraordinary powers of binding and loosing for both here and hereafter. In the other passage (18:15) the church is recognized as the final judge for decision in cases of dispute, its decisions are ratified in heaven, the

---

1. St.Matt.,241; also Feine, Theol.des N.T.,88.
2. Holtzmann, N.T.Theol.I,268f; Weinel, Bib.Theol.des N.T., 106f; Loisy, Les Évangiles Synop.,II,8.
3. Harnack, Luke the Physician, 167; Cf. Montefiore, Syn. Gospels, I, LXXV, LXXIX.

is generally agreed that the words here attributed to Jesus are a reflection of Apostolic history rather than an original saying, although McNeile thinks Jesus may well have used the term (ἐκκλησία) to describe his body of followers.[1] On the other hand many scholars feel that the idea of a church, an earthly institution, was foreign to Jesus' thought. The probabilities in the case lie on the side against the use of the term by Jesus. The appearance of ἐκκλησία in Matthew is entirely understandable in view of his time and circumstances. "The gospel of Matthew was written as an apology against the objections and calumnies of the Jews, which were soon adopted by the Gentiles. This evangelist alone has a distinct interest in our Lord's teaching as such; he institutes, he proves, and all the while he keeps the church well in the foreground."[2] Matthew's references to the church appear but twice but its position powers and responsibilities are grounded in his mind. In the Petrine passage (16:17f) the church is founded on rock, it belongs to Christ ("my church"), its permanence is greater than the gates of Hades, and Peter, as leader, had extraordinary powers of binding and loosing for both here and hereafter. In the other passage (18:18) the church is recognized as the final judge for decision in cases of dispute, its decisions are ratified in heaven, the

---

1. St. Matt., 241; also Tresmontant, Théol. des N.T., 38.
2. Holtzmann, N.T. Theol. I.240f; Weinel, Bib. Theol. des N.T., 108f; Lagrange, Les Evangiles Synop., 11.3.
3. Harnack, Lehre the Apostolen, 107; Cf. Montefiore, Syn. Gospels, I. lxxv, lxxix.

whole church, not Peter only, shares in binding and loosing and Christ's presence is promised in the church where even two or three are gathered.[1]

The kingdom of God is not one of Paul's favorite terms. He refers to it (1) as "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom.14:17). (Cf. I Cor.4:20) (2) its true activity in "not in word but in power" (I Cor.4:20). (3) he has fellow workers in the kingdom of God (Col.4:11). (4) Christians have been brought (translated) into the kingdom of the Son of his love (Col.1:13) (5) the kingdom is also a final goal, a perfected society of the future world, which is to be inherited by those who are worthy of such a reward, (I Cor.6:9, 15:50, Gal.5:21, II Thess.1:5). Paul had been trained in Jewish thought. When he became a Christian he did not abandon the thought-forms which he already held. He did not use kingdom of heaven much but he was acquainted with the term and held to its essential ideas. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation and therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith (Rom.1:16-17). "For Israel everything was seen in the light of the special relation in which God stood to his own people. All that is tenderest, all that is most gracious, was concentrated upon this relation. And the word for it all -- the word that

---

1. Cf. Moffatt, Historical N.T., 82f.

whole church, not Peter only, shares in binding and loosing and Christ's presence is promised in the church where even two or three are gathered.[1]

The kingdom of God is not one of Paul's favorite terms. He refers to it (1) as "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom.14:17). (Cf. I Cor.4:20) (2) its true activity is "not in word but in power" (I Cor.4:20). (3) He has fellow workers in the kingdom of God (Col.4:11). (4) Christians have been brought (translated) into the kingdom of the Son of his love (Col.1:13) (5) the kingdom is also a final goal, a perfected society of the future world, which is to be inherited by those who are worthy of such a reward. (I Cor.6:9, 15:50, Gal.5:21, II Thess.1:5). Paul has been trained in Jewish thought. When he became a Christian he did not abandon the thought-forms which he already held. He did not use Kingdom of heaven much but he was acquainted with the term and held to its essential ideas. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation and therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith (Rom.1:16-17). "For Israel everything was seen in the light of the special relation in which God stood to his own people. All that is tendered, all that is most precious, was concentrated upon this relation. And the word for it all -- the word that

---

1. Cf. Moffatt, Historical N.T., 88f.

describes the faithfulness of God to his covenant with his people -- was righteousness. That one comprehensive word described the deepest workings of the Divine Mind as it went forth in lovingkindness and pity to the people of his choice."[1] This active energizing righteousness of God -- God at work in the world -- is the same idea as the kingdom of God when the origin is considered. "In either case it is the goodness and love of God, actively intervening to guide, redeem, sustain and bless his people."[2] There are similarities in ideas here with Matthew but no evidence of influence.

Paul's fondness for ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ is everywhere evident in his letters, and in all probability in his letter to the Thessalonians there is the earliest use of the term in the New Testament. "He never speaks of the kingdom of God distinctly as equivalent to the church, though it was open to him to do so, because the mystical union of Christians with Christ involves their common share (κοινωνία) in one and the same Spirit and Life. Their condition is therefore a corporate union. And the Body of Christ might easily have been called the realm, the sphere, the area, of God's sovereignty. But this quasi local meaning of the Kingdom nowhere occurs in the New Testament."[3] The church appears

---

1. Sanday, J.T.S. I,4,485.
2. Ibid, 491.
3. McNeile, N.T. Tchg. in Light of St.Paul's, 22 (note 1.)

describes the faithfulness of God to His covenant with His people -- was righteousness. That one comprehensive word described the deepest workings of the Divine Mind as it went forth in loving-kindness and pity to the people of His choice.[1] This native unwavering righteousness of God -- God at work in the world -- is the same idea as the kingdom of God when the origin is considered. "In either case it is the goodness and love of God, actively intervening to guide, rescue, sustain and bless His people."[2] There are similarities in ideas here with Saturus but no evidence of influence.

Paul's fondness for [illegible] is everywhere evident in his letters, and in all probability in his letter to the Thessalonians there is the earliest use of the term in the New Testament. He never speaks of the kingdom of God distinctly as equivalent to the church, though it was open to him to do so, because the mystical union of Christians with Christ involves their common share (κοινωνία) in one and the same Spirit and life. Their communion is therefore a corporate union. And the body of Christ might easily have been called the realm, the sphere, the area, of God's sovereignty. But this usual logical meaning of the kingdom nowhere occurs in the New Testament."[3] The church appears

---

1. Sanday, T.T.G. I,4,48.
2. Ibid. 491.
3. McNeile, N.T. Time in Light of St. Paul's, 22 (note 1.)

in Paul's writings in many aspects. In many ways it means as much for him as kingdom means in the gospel. Hort finds eleven classes of Christian societies to which the term ἐκκλησία was applied.[1] These can be summarized into the following classes: (1) the general name for Christian believers (2) the individual group located, e.g., at Thessalonica or in a house, (3) the assembly of believers (4) the one universal spiritual totality of believers. It is certain that Paul did not create the term but it is equally certain that he gave it deeper meanings than it had ever had before in Christian thinking. "Dieser Gottesgemeinde, diesen Christus-Versammlungen gilt die Lebensarbeit des Paulus."[2] He stresses the relation of church and God; only once does he refer to the churches of Christ (Rom.16:16); occasionally he refers to the churches of Jesus Christ. He finds striking comparisons of Christ and the church. The church is a building or temple with Christ as a foundation (I Cor.3:10-15; Eph.2:20-22; cf. II Cor.6:16). It is the body of Christ (I Cor.12:12, 27; Eph.1:23; 4:12; 5:23; Col.1:18; 2:19) or he is the Head (Eph.5:23-24; 1:23; Col.2:19) or the church is the bride of Christ (II Cor.11:2; Eph.5:32). The church is a household of faith, a family of God, (Gal.6:10; Eph.2:19). The church is a new creation (Eph.2:14-15; 4:13.) Paul is unique in this conception of the church.

---

1. The Christian Ecclesia, 116-118.
2. Schmitz, Die Christus - gemeinschaft des Paulus, 222.

in Paul's writings in many aspects. In many ways it means as much for him as Kingdom means in the Gospel. Most frequently always changes of Christian association to which the term church was applied.[1] These can be summarized into the following classes: (1) the general name for Christian believers (2) the individual group locales, e.g., at Thessalonica or in a house, (3) the assembly of believers (4) the one universal spiritual reality of believers. It is certain that Paul did not create the term but it is equally certain that he gave it deeper meaning than it had ever had before in Christian thinking. Dieser Gottesgemeinde, diesen Christus-Verwandtschaft gibt die Lebensmacht des Paulus.[2] He stresses the relation of church and God; only once does he refer to the church of Christ (Rom.16:16); occasionally he refers to the church as Jesus Christ. He views stirring cooperations of Christ and the church. The church is a building or temple with Christ as a foundation (1 Cor.3:10-16; Eph.2:20-22; cf. 1 Cor.6:16). It is the body of Christ (1 Cor.12:12, 27; Eph.1:22; 4:12; 5:23; Col.1:18; 2:19) or he is the head (Eph.5:23-24; 1:22; Col.2:19) or the church is the bride of Christ (2 Cor.11:2; Eph.5:32). The church is a household or family, a family of God (Gal.6:10; Eph.2:19). The church is a new creation (Eph.2:15-16; 4:24). Paul is unique in this conception of the church.

---

1. Die Christlichen Kodizes, 112-113.
2. Schmitz, Die Christus - Gemeinschaft des Paulus, 227.

Other thinkers of his day and even later like Matthew, regarded the gospel as Judaism made perfect or as the Old Testament religion rightly understood. "But Paul in connecting Christianity with the promise given to Abraham, passing thus beyond the Law, that is the actual Old Testament religion, has not only given an historic foundation but also claimed for the Father of Judaism a unique significance for Christianity."[1] This idea that the Christians were the people or church of God was one of far-reaching consequence. They had an historic self-consciousness and also were new and unique. "Nothing more comprehensive or complete or impressive than this consciousness can be conceived."[2] Since Paul worked among Gentiles, terms like "the New Israel" or the People of God" would not be suitable, hence the term church was a most appropriate label. While Paul thought of individual churches he "rose to the thought of one universal church."[3]

One of the most important concepts which Paul has of the life in the church is κοινωνία or Fellowship. This term, frequently translated communion, emphasizes the social solidarity which was basic in Paul's mind but which modern individualism often underestimates or misses altogether. "It would well repay the student of Paul to reread the epistles

---

1. Harnack, Hist.of Dogma,I,88 (note); Briggs (N.T.Doctrine of the Church, A.J.T. IV, 1; 5, 22.) points out that there are ten synonymous terms for representing the New Testament doctrine of the church and adds, "The New Testament doctrine of the ἐκκλησία must be built on the teaching of Paul."
2. Harnack, Miss. & Expans. of Christianity, I, 301.
3. Hamilton, Church of God. II, 39.

other thinkers of his day and even later like Bushnell, regarded the gospel as Judaism made perfect or as the old Testament religion rightly understood. But Paul in connecting Christianity with the promise given to Abraham, passing thus beyond the law, that is the natural Old Testament religion, has not only given an historic foundation but also claimed for the Maker of Judaism a unique significance for Christianity.[1] This idea that the Christians were the people or church of God was one of far-reaching consequence. They had an historic self-consciousness and also were new and unique. "Nothing more comprehensive or complete or intensive than this consciousness can be conceived."[2] Since Paul worked among Gentiles, terms like "the New Israel" or "the People of God" would not be suitable, hence the term church was a most appropriate label. While Paul thought of individual churches he "rose to the idea of one universal church."[3]

One of the most important concepts which Paul has of the life in the church is [illegible] or fellowship. This term, frequently translated communion, emphasizes the social solidarity which was basic in Paul's mind but which modern individualism often underestimates or misses altogether. "It would well repay the student of Paul to trace the [illegible]

---

1. Hatch, Hist. of Doctr., I, 66 (note); Briggs (W.T. Doctrine of the Church, A.J.T. IV, 1; 8, 97.) points out that there are ten synonymous terms for representing the New Testament doctrine of the church and adds, "The New Testament doctrine of the [illegible] must be built on the teaching of Paul."
2. Hatch, Hist. & Expans. of Christianity, I, 301.
3. Hamilton, Church of God. II, 35.

with an eye to Paul's insistence on the solidarity of man; the joint interest binding humanity - and particularly Christians together.... The law of the Spirit makes men one; it is only the law in their members that makes them many; whoever identified himself with Christ, identified himself with Christ's idea of the solidarity of man."[1] Paul's usage of κοινωνία reveals that it is a fellowship of Christ (I Cor. 1:9)[2] and also of Spirit (Phil.2:1). It also appears in the well known apostolic benediction - the communion or fellowship of the Spirit (II Cor.13:13). It is a fellowship of faith (Philem.6). This fellowship was essentially spiritual. "It is held together by spiritual bonds, by a common relation to Christ, faith, by a common outlook on the world. For the fellowship is not merely a fellowship of believers inter se, nor yet a fellowship of believers individually with the Spirit, but a complex experience which included both. It was in relationship with one another that men continuously realized their relation to Christ and to God through Him."[3] Under all these varied aspects in which Paul developed and enriched the conception of the Christian community there is one principle which is implicit throughout, that is, life in the Christian sense of the word. God "hath made us alike to-

---

1. Enslin M.S. The Ethics of Paul, 107-108. Unpub.Th.D.(Harvard) Dissertation; cf.Rauschenbusch,Theol.for Social Gospel, 134, 144.
2. That is, a fellowship belonging to and named after him, cf. Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul 160, note 1.
3. Ibid, 161.

with an eye to Paul's insistence on the solidarity of man; the joint interest binding humanity - and particularly Christians together.... The law of the Spirit makes men one; it is only the law in their members that makes them many: whoever identified himself with Christ, identified himself with Christ's idea of the solidarity of man.[1] Paul's usage of koinonia reveals that it is a fellowship of Christ (1 Cor. 1:9)[2] and also of Spirit (Phil.2:1). It also appears in the well known apostolic benediction - the communion or fellowship of the Spirit (II Cor.13:13). It is a fellowship of faith (Philem.6). This fellowship was essentially spiritual. "It is held together by spiritual bonds, by a common relation to Christ, faith, by a common outlook on the world. For the fellowship is not merely a fellowship of believers inter se, nor yet a fellowship of believers individually with the Spirit, but a complex experience which included both. It was in relationship with one another that men continuously realized their relation to Christ and to God through him."[3] Under all these varied aspects in which Paul developed and enriched the conception of the Christian community there is one principle which is implicit throughout, that is, life in the Christian sense of the word. God hath made us alive to-

---

1. Theilin W.S. The Kingdom of God, 107-108. Dupuy, R.C. (Harvard Dissertation: of Rauschenbusch, Theol. for Social Gospel, 134, 141.
2. That is, a fellowship belonging to and named after God, cf. Scott, Christianity acc. to St. Paul 160, note 1.
3. Ibid, 161.

gether with Christ" (Eph.2:5; Col.2:1) Christ is a life-giving Spirit (I Cor.15:45). "We are alive by the Spirit (Gal.5:25). The mind of the Spirit is life and peace (Rom.8:6). "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk" (Gal.5:25). If any one is in Christ Jesus he is a new creation, he puts on a new man "renewed into knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3:10). Out of this new life Paul writes his letters and develops his thought. He is a different man and has been renewed entirely. He is no longer the same. He lives and Christ lives in him.[1] He lives in the Spirit (Rom.8:9) and in Christ, and as Weiss points out any one who wishes to understand Paul must understand the idea that there is a new creation in Christ.[2] It is uncertain just what Paul means by stating that "The Lord is the Spirit" (II Cor.3:17) but it is clear that in his thought there is a practical equating of Spirit and Christ, though probably not an identity. He holds a distinction between them.[3] There is life in Christ and in the Spirit interchangeably. Christ is

---

1. Schmitz, Das Lebensgefühl des Paulus, 41.
2. Das Urchristentum, 341.
3. Scott, Spirit in the New Testament, 182-183; cf. Garvie, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, (art.) Exp. Times XXXVIII, 11, 487. "However intimately Paul relates Christ and the Spirit, so that whenever Christ is believed as Savior and Lord, the Spirit is possessed, I am convinced that he nowhere identifies Christ and the Spirit, still less does he confuse them."

father with Christ" (Eph.5:6; Gal.2:1) Christ is a life-giving Spirit (I Cor.15:45). "We are saved by the Spirit (Gal.5:22). The mind of the Spirit is life and peace (Rom.8:6). "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk" (Gal.5:25). If any one is in Christ Jesus he is a new creation, he puts on a new man "renewed into knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3:10). Out of this new life Paul writes his letters and develops his thought. He is a different man and has been renewed entirely. He is no longer the same. He lives and Christ lives in him.[1] He lives in the Spirit (Rom.8:9) and in Christ, and as Weiss points out any one who wishes to understand Paul must understand the idea that there is a new creation in Christ.[2] It is uncertain just what Paul means by stating that "The Lord is the Spirit" (II Cor.3:17) but it is clear that in his thought there is a practical equating of Spirit and Christ, though probably not an identity. He holds a distinction between them.[3] There is life in Christ and in the Spirit interchangeably. Christ is

---

1. Schmitz, Das Lebensgefühl des Paulus, 41.
2. Das Urchristentum, 341.
3. Scott, Spirit in the New Testament, 132-133; cf. Garvie, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, (ext) Exp. Times XXVIII, 11, 427. "However intimately Paul relates Christ and the Spirit, so that whenever Christ is believed as Savior and Lord, the Spirit is possessed. I am convinced that he nowhere identifies Christ and the Spirit, still less does he confuse them."

spiritual and hence the presence in which believers lived. Thus he can be the Head of the Church or the Second Adam of a new race. "Ye are all one being in Christ" (Gal.3: 28). There is to be a complete and perfected humanity in Him. "Till we all attain (not individually but as a whole) .....unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph.4:13). On the other hand the church is the means in which Christ is continuously realizing himself (Eph.1:22-23). The fellowship is an inseparable part of his body, and being in Christ meant being in the Fellowship in which Christ is expressed.

With such teachings as Paul's about the many sided communal life of believers it is not strange that Matthew, written years after Paul, should use ἐκκλησία twice; it is remarkable that he did not use the word a great deal.[1] It is a testimony to the fact that he usually used his sources without materially altering them. Matthew's references to the church reflect a time when the church was believed to be an institution founded by Jesus. His plan for settlements of disputes within the church is reminiscent of Paul's rebuke to the Corinthians (I Cor.6:1). But the reference to the founding of the church and its special control by Peter is an attempt perhaps to exalt Peter to a position that is equal to

---

1. Especially so, if as Burton thinks (Gal. 419) the use of ecclesia among Christians arose first on Gentile soil and with reference to the local congregations.

spiritual and hence the presence in which believers live. Thus we can be the Head of the Church or the Second Lord of a new race. "Ye are all one being in Christ" (Gal.3:28). There is to be a complete and perfected humanity in him. "Till we all attain (not individually but as a whole) .....unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph.4:13). On the other hand the church is the means in which Christ is continuously realizing himself (Eph.1:22-23). The fellowship is an inseparable part of his body, and being in Christ means being in the fellowship in which Christ is expressed.

With such teachings as Paul's about the many sided communal life of believers it is not strange that Matthew, written years after Paul, should use ἐκκλησία twice; it is remarkable that he did not use the word a great deal.[1] It is a testimony to the fact that he usually used his sources without materially altering them. Matthew's references to the church reflect a time when the church was believed to be an institution founded by Jesus. His plan for settlements of disputes within the church is reminiscent of Paul's refuge to the Corinthians (I Cor.6:1). But the reference to the founding of the church and its special control by Peter is an attempt perhaps to exalt Peter to a position that is equal to

---

1. Especially so, if an Aryan claims (Gal. 3:6) the use of concubis among Christians arose first on Christian soil and with reference to the local congregations.

Paul's (cf. the following section). There are many ideas in common about the kingdom and its members but no more than would normally be found in Christian communities. On this subject of the church the conclusion must be that Paul took Jesus' teachings about the kingdom and developed them especially in a mystical way and Matthew reflects church terminology but no distinctly Pauline ideas.[1]

---

1. Burton & Willoughby, Intro. to Gospels, 102, take the opposite view. "Its (Matthew) conception of the church and Peter's relation to it belongs to a period distinctly later than that of the Pauline controversy. Its references to the church are too few to permit us to lay much stress on them but the total evidence tends to the conclusion that the idea of the church expressed so forcibly in the sixteenth chapter is a Pauline contribution to Christian thought. At least it appears first in his writings."

7. APOSTLES AND DISCIPLES

Matthew uses the term "Apostles" (ἀπόστολοι) but once (10:2) where the twelve apostles are named and commissioned. He calls them the "Twelve" four times (10:5; 26:14,20,47.) and the "twelve disciples" (Mt.only) four times (10:1; 11:1; 20:17; 26:20).[1] The Twelve and the apostles are identical.[2] He writes once of the "eleven disciples" (28:16). In his thought there does not appear a wider circle of disciples like the seventy in Luke. The restricted usage of "apostle" in Matthew (and Mark) is in noticeable contrast with Paul and Luke where "apostle" appears sixty-eight times out of a total of seventy-nine in the New Testament.[3] Matthew uses "disciples" (μαθηταί) frequently but it does not occur in Paul. It is evident that there is considerable variation between Matthew and Paul in the use of these terms. Matthew reflects a time when the circle of the twelve had come to be respected to a higher degree than in Paul's time.

Paul's personal contacts with the Apostles naturally produced a different attitude from Matthew's for "it

---

1. "L'Évangile de Marc nous montre le caractère primitif de l'institution des Douze; l'Évangile de Matthieu, le caractère qu'elle a revêtu dans les milieux judéo-chrétiens, par suite de la valeur symbolique attribuée au nombre douze." Monniere, L'Notion de l'Apostolat,150.
2. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 526 f; Hort, Christian Ecclesia, 26 f.
3. Lightfoot, Galatians, 91; Monnier, op.cit., 23.

7. APOSTLES AND DISCIPLES

Matthew uses the term "Apostles" (ἀπόστολοι) but once (10:2) where the twelve apostles are named and commissioned. He calls them the "twelve" four times (10:1; 26:14,20,47) and the "twelve disciples" (μαθηταί) four times (10:1; 11:1; 20:17; 26:20).[1] The twelve and the apostles are identical.[2] He writes once of the "eleven disciples" (28:16). In his Gospel there does not appear a wider circle of disciples like the seventy in Luke. The restricted usage of "apostle" in Matthew (and Mark) is in noticeable contrast with Paul and Luke where "apostle" appears sixty-eight times out of a total of seventy-nine in the New Testament.[3] Matthew uses "disciples" (μαθηταί) frequently but it does not occur in Paul. It is evident that there is considerable variation between Matthew and Paul in the use of these terms. Matthew reflects a time when the circle of the twelve had come to be regarded to a higher degree than in Paul's time.

Paul's personal contacts with the Apostles naturally produced a different attitude from Matthew's for "it

---

1. "L'Evangile de Marc nous montre le caractère primitif de l'institution des Douze: l'Evangile de Matthieu, le caractère qu'elle a revêtu dans les différents judaïsmes chrétiens, par suite de la valeur symbolique attribuée au nombre douze." Monnier, L'Notion de l'Apostolat, 100.
2. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 502 f; Hort, Christian Ecclesia, 22 f.
3. Lightfoot, Galatians, 91; Monnier, op.cit., 82.

is unquestionably evident that Paul had a close historical relation both directly and indirectly, to the first disciples with whom he was in essential harmony until the unhappy break with Peter and Barnabas at Antioch."[1] His usage of the term "apostle" varies. He writes of those sent out or delegated by the church (II Cor.8:23). Epaphroditus is an apostle from Philippi to Paul in his need (Phil.2:25). Only twice does Paul refer to "all the apostles" as if that expression meant the Twelve (I Cor.15:5,7; Gal.1:19.) He usually refers to himself as an apostle in his salutations.[2] "With the conversion of Saul and his adoption for himself, or the ascription by others to him, of the title ἀπόστολος that title enters upon a new stage of its history."[3] Though he is the least of the apostles because he persecuted the church (I Cor.15:9) yet he clings to the fact of his apostleship. "He unhesitatingly appropriated to himself the title and function of an apostle of Christ, which he conceived himself to hold by direct divine authority, subject in no way to the control of those who were apostles before him."[4] He names as apostles: Barnabas (I Cor.9:5,6; Gal.2:9) and James, the Lord's brother (Gal.1:19) and Silvanus and Timothy (I Thess.2:7; II Cor.1:19) and Adronicus

---

1. Case, A.J.T., XI 2, 286.
2. Knox, St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem, 365.
3. Burton, A.J.T., XVI, 4, 574.
4. Burton, Ibid, 580.

is unquestionably evident that Paul had a close historical relation both directly and indirectly, to the first disciples with whom he was in essential harmony until the unhappy break with Peter and Barnabas at Antioch."[1] His usage of the term "apostle" varies. He writes of those sent out or delegated by the church (II Cor.8:23). Epaphroditus is an apostle from Philippi to Paul in his need (Phil.2:25). Only twice does Paul refer to "all the apostles" as if that expression meant the Twelve (I Cor.15:5,7; Gal.1:19). He usually refers to himself as an apostle in his salutations.[2] With the conversion of Saul and his adoption for himself, or the ascription by others to him, of the title "apostle" that title enters upon a new stage of its history.[3] Though he is the least of the apostles because he persecuted the church (I Cor.15:9) yet he clings to the fact of his apostleship. "He unhesitatingly appropriated to himself the title and function of an apostle of Christ, which he conceived himself to hold by direct divine authority, subject in no way to the control of those who were apostles before him."[4] He names as apostles: Barnabas (I Cor.9:6; Gal.2:9) and James, the Lord's brother (Gal.1:19) and Silvanus and Timothy (I Thess.2:7; II Cor.1:19) and Adronicus

---

1. Case, A.J.T., XII:2, 206.
2. Knox, W., Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, 38f.
3. Burton, A.J.T., XVII, 4, 574.
4. Burton, Ibid, 588.

and Junias (Rom.16:7). When he lists those men who are set in the churches by God, he twice places the leading officers as the apostles (I Cor.12:28; Eph.4:11). There is no limitation of the term to the ones selected by Jesus. This freedom of usage indicates an early date before the term had acquired any special meaning. It is doubtful if Lightfoot's suggestion[1] that the office had two qualifications, (1) to have been a witness of the resurrection and (2) to have the signs of an apostle (II Cor.12:1-2) can be maintained. For he excludes Timothy when Paul includes him (I Thess.2:7). The main thought with Paul is for the person to be a commissioned and trusted one who is recommended by the church or Christ. He will not allow his apostleship to be challenged as his Galatian letter shows. The main credential is that Jesus has called him. This may be a reflection of the close relationship known by the original disciples who had been called by Jesus. But there is a difference in the fact that the disciples in the gospel are trained as by a teacher while in Paul's thought the relation is a mystical one, though the "I am with you" (28:20) promise after the resurrection has a resemblance to Paul's thought. Paul recognizes false apostles who challenged Paul's apostleship because he had not been a companion of Jesus or had not been commissioned from Jerusalem or both. He sees a distinction

---

1. Galatians, 94-95.

and Jesus (Jno.16:7). When he lists those men who are set in the Church by God, he twice places the leading officers as the apostles (I Cor.12:28; Eph.4:11). There is no limitation of the term to the ones selected by Jesus. This freedom of usage indicates an early date before the term had acquired any special meaning. It is doubtful if Lightfoot's suggestion[1] that the office has two qualifications, (1) to have been a witness of the resurrection and (2) to have the signs of an apostle (II Cor.12:1-6) can be maintained. Nor he excludes Timothy when Paul includes him (I Thess.3:7). The main thought with Paul is for the person to be a commissioned and trusted one who is recommended by the church or Christ. He will not allow his apostleship to be challenged as his defection later shows. The main credential is that Jesus has called him. This may be a reflection of the close relationship known by the original disciples who had been called by Jesus. But there is a difference in the fact that the disciples in the gospel are trained as by a teacher while in Paul's thought the relation is a spiritual one. Though the "I am with you" (Mt.28:20) promise after the resurrection has a resemblance to Paul's thought. Paul recognizes false apostles who challenged Paul's apostleship because he had not been a companion of Jesus or had not been commissioned from Jerusalem or both. He been a strategic

---

1. Galatians, 92-93.

between an apostleship to the circumcision and the uncircumcision (Gal.2:7-9). He holds to the signs and wonders and mighty works which verify an apostle (II Cor.12:12). This is like the commission in Matthew (10:5 f.) except the latter limits the work of the Twelve, in this instance, to Jewish people. The limitation is cancelled in the Great Commission (28:18-20). The apostleship is a gift of God's grace (Rom.1:5; 15:15; Gal.2:9, I Cor.3:10; 15:10). It came to have a traveling missionary meaning especially with Paul.[1] He and Matthew agree that the laborer should be paid (I Cor.9:14). In Matthew however the pay is food (10:9) but in Paul it is wages, (II Cor.11:8-9) although he himself often made his own way. There is a heightening of glory and honor for the Twelve in Matthew. They are to sit upon twelve thrones and judge Israel (18:28) but with Paul all the saints shall judge the world (I Cor.6:2). The disciples according to Matthew have <u>little</u> faith (14:31; 6:30; 8:26.) but not as in Mark (4:40). "How is it ye have <u>not</u> faith?"[2] The Sermon on the Mount is for the disciples primarily (5:1). The disciples are the "Sons of the Kingdom"

---

1. However, "it was not indiscriminately applied to any preacher or missionary of the Christian message" though the number may not be exactly determined. Burton, A.J.T., XVI, 4, 576, 581.
2. Allen's list (St. Matthew, XXXIII-IV) showing Matthew changes favoring the disciples is decisive.

between an apostleship to the circumcision and the uncircumcision (Gal.2:7-9). He holds to the signs and wonders and mighty works which verify an apostle (II Cor.12:12). This is like the commission in Matthew (10:5 f.) except the latter limits the work of the Twelve, in this instance, to Jewish people. The limitation is cancelled in the Great Commission (28:19-20). The apostleship is a gift of God's grace (Gal.1:9; 1Ti:12; Gal.2:9, I Cor.3:10; 15:10). It seems to have a travelling missionary meaning especially with Paul.[1] He and Matthew agree that the laborer should be paid (I Cor.9:14). In Matthew however the pay is food (10:9) but in Paul it is wages. (II Cor.11:8-9) although he himself often pays his own way. There is a delightening of glory and honor for the Twelve in Matthew. They are to sit upon twelve thrones and judge Israel (19:28) but with Paul all the saints shall judge the world (I Cor.6:2). The disciples according to Matthew have little faith (14:31; 8:26; 8:32.) but not so in Mark (4:40). "How is it ye have not faith?" The sermon on the mount is for the disciples primarily (5:1). The disciples are the "Sons of the Kingdom"

---

1. However, "it was not indiscriminately (to lies) to any preacher or missionary of the Christian message" though the number may not be exactly determined. Burton, A.J.T., XVI, 4, 576, 581.
2. Allen's list (St. Matthew, XXXVII-IV) showing Matthew changes favoring the disciples is decisive.

(13:38). The disciples are like prophets and the righteous men of the Old Testament who brought blessings.[1] Jesus defends his disciples with unusual vigor against the Pharisees (12:7). Words spoken to all in Luke (9:23) are given to the disciples in Matthew (16:24). They are given extraordinary authority in binding and loosing, a commission previously given to Peter. (18:18,16,19). They are granted extraordinary power in prayer where two or three of them are gathered (18:19) which finds a reflection in Paul (I Cor.5:4). In general it can be said that Matthew is exceedingly fond of "disciple", "to disciple" and "brother" in the Christian sense.[2] To be sure Matthew shows Jesus sharply rebuking Peter and correcting disputes of superiority among disciples (20:25) but he generally takes an attitude of respect and honor for the disciples that is in striking contrast with Paul who was willing to assert his independence of the apostles at Jerusalem and to correct them when necessary. (Gal.1:12; 2:11f). Possibly the canonical Matthew was also influenced by traditions received from his source, i.e. one of the Twelve.

There remains on the other hand an unusual contrast which has been attributed to anti-Paulinism in Matthew. The

---

1. Findlay, Jesus as They Saw Him, III, 256.
2. Ibid, 261-271. Findlay notes this characteristic in 8:21; 10:1, 25; 11:1; 12:2, 49; 13:36; 14:19, 26: 15:12, 23, 36; 16:5, 20, 21; 17:6, 13; 18:1; 21:6, 20: 24:3; 26:1, 8, 20, 26, 35, 45, 56; 27:64; 28:8, 16, 19; 27:57; brother, 5:22, 23, 24, 47; 7:4, 5; 18:15, 21, 35.

(18:33). The disciples are like prophets and the rightness
men of God Jesus's brought blessings.[1] Jesus de-
fends his disciples with unusual vigor against the Pharisees
(12:7). Words spoken to all in Luke (9:23) are given to the
disciples in Matthew (16:24). They are given ministerial
authority in binding and loosing, a commission previously
given to Peter. (18:18,16,19). They are promised extraordi-
nary power in prayer when two or three of them are gathered
(18:19) which finds a reflection in Paul (1 Cor.5:4). In
general it can be said that Matthew is exceedingly fond of
"disciples", the disciples" and "brother" in the Christian
sense.[2] To be more particular Jesus sharply rebukes
Peter and correcting disputes of superiority among disciples
(20:25) but he generally takes an attitude of respect and
honor for the disciples that is in striking contrast with Paul
who was willing to assert his independence of the apostles at
Jerusalem and to correct them when necessary. (Gal.1:12; 2:14).
Possibly the conservat Matthew was also influenced by tradi-
tions received from his source, i.e. one of the Twelve.

There remains on the other hand an unusual contrast
which has been attributed to anti-Paulinism in Matthew. The

---

1. Kingsley, Jesus as They Saw Him, 111, 386.
2. Ibid, 391-92. Finally note this characteristic in 8:23; 10:1, 20, 11:1; 12:2, 49; 13:36; 15:19, 30; 16:13, 20, 22; 16:6, 20, 21; 17:6, 14; 18:1; 21:6, 20; 24:3; 26:1, 8, 20, 26, 35, 36; 27:64; 28:8, 16, 18; 27:57; 28:7, 10; Brother, 5:22, 23, 24, 47; 7:4, 5; 18:15, 21, 35.

evangelist plainly exalts Peter. This Petrinism however is not Judaistic nor anti-Pauline.[1] If it is a polemic at all, it may rather be attributed to the Antiochene opposition to the conservatism of James.[2] "The claim of Antioch is less obvious (than Rome's) but more probable. The Epistles of Ignatius suggest Matthew was the Antiochene gospel; the tradition that Peter was first bishop of Antioch is as old and as probable as that which makes him the first bishop of Rome. Both reflect his historical connection with these cities, though expressed in the language of later ecclesiastical organization. The hypothesis therefore may be ventured that "Tu es Petros" represented not Roman but Antiochene thought and reflects the struggle between Jerusalem and Antioch for supremacy. Jerusalem had James the brother of the Lord who presided over the flock at Mount Zion. But Antioch claimed Peter, not James, had been appointed by Jesus; on him, not James, was the church founded; and he, not James, had the keys to the kingdom to admit or exclude whom he would. This of course is a hypothesis which cannot be demonstrated, but seems more probable than the suggestion that the passage had originally anything to do with the claims of Rome."[3] The gospel of Matthew is a via media[4] between James and Peter. The tradition of a Petrine bishopric in Antioch

---

1. Kreyenbuhl, Der Apostle Paulus und die Urgemeinde, Z.N.T.W., VIII, 167f.
2. See above page 32-34.
3. Foakes-Jackson & Lake, Beg. of Christianity, I, 329-330.
4. Streeter, Four Gospels, 258, 514f.

evangelist plainly speaks rather. This terminus however is not indicative but anti-Petrine.[1] If it is a polemic at all, it may rather be attributed to the Antiochene opposition to the consecration of James.[2] "The claim of Antioch is less obvious (than Jame's) but more probable. The Spirales of Ignatius suggest Antioch was the Antiochene Gospel; the tradition that Peter was first bishop of Antioch is as old and as probable as that which makes him the first bishop of Rome. Both reflect his historical connection with these sites, though expressed in the language of later ecclesiastical organization. The hypothesis therefore may be ventured that "Tu es Petros" represented not Roman but Antiochene thought and reflects the struggle between Jerusalem and Antioch for supremacy. Jerusalem had James the brother of the Lord who presided over the flock at Mount Sion. But Antioch claimed Peter, not James, was appointed by Jesus: on him, not James, was the church founded; and he, not James, had the keys to the kingdom to admit or exclude whom he would. This of course is a hypothesis which cannot be demonstrated, but seems more probable than the suggestion that the passage has originally anything to do with the claims of Rome."[3] The gospel of Matthew is-a-via media[4] between James and Peter. The tradition of a Petrine primacy in Antioch

---

1. Harnack, Der Apostel Paulus und die Urgemeinde. S.B.P.A., XLIII, 1927.
2. See above page 114.
3. Jackson & Lake, Beg. of Christianity, I, 322-323.
4. Streeter, The Gospels, 499, 501.

is best understood in the light of a gospel which exalts Peter's primacy. Peter is given a new name (4:18); at his home his mother-in-law is healed (8:14); he is first[1] in the list of apostles (10:2); he walks on the water (14:28-31); he is the questioner about defilements (15:15); he is given the keys of the kingdom for binding and loosing (16:17-19); he is bidden to get the half-shekel for the tax (17:24-27); he asks how often one should forgive (18:21). On the other hand it is curious that the resurrection appearances to Peter, given by other narrators, (I Cor.15:5; Jo.21:15-22) are not mentioned by Matthew, who also leaves unnamed the disciple who drew the sword but who is identified in the Fourth Gospel as Peter. (Mt.26:52-54; Jo.18:10).

There is a general similarity in the conception of the function of the apostles. Paul's conception of an apostle's work was that of planting Christianity. An apostle was divinely commissioned to found churches and hence he was not dependent upon human authorization.[2] This same general thought is found in Matthew (28:19-20) but Paul is different in his special emphasis upon his right and duty to establish churches in new regions among the Gentiles and to reprove, exhort or command his converts, (I Thess.4:2; II Thess.3:4,6;

---

1. Monnier, La Notion de l'Apostolat, 131. "Quant Matthieu ecrit: πρῶτος Σίμων dans le dénombrement qu'il fait des Douze, il apparaît que Simon, dans sa pensée, est bien le premier à tous égards."
2. Burton, A.J.T.,XVI, 4, 584; Haupt, Zum Verstandnis des Apostolats un N.T., 135; Monnier, op.cit., 37.

UNIVERSITY OF

is best understood in the light of a gospel which exalts Peter's primacy. Peter is given a new name (1:42); at his home his mother-in-law is healed (4:14); he is first[1] in the list of apostles (10:2); he walks on the water (14:28-31); he is the questioner about settlements (18:21); he is given the keys of the kingdom for binding and loosing (16:17-19); he is widow to get the half-shekel for the tax (17:24-27); he asks how often one should forgive (18:21). On the other hand it is curious that the resurrection appearances to Peter, given by other narratives, (1 Cor.15:5; Lk.24:34-35) are not mentioned by Matthew, who also leaves unnamed the disciple who does the sword but who is identified in the Fourth Gospel as Peter. (Mt.26:52-54; Jn.18:10).

There is a general similarity in the conception of the function of the apostles. Paul's conception of an apostle's work was that of planting Christianity. An apostle was divinely commissioned to found churches and hence he was not dependent upon human authorization.[2] This same general thought is found in Matthew (28:19-20) but Paul is different in his special emphasis upon his right and duty to establish churches in new regions among the Gentiles and to reprove, admonit or commend his converts. (1 Thess.4:8; II Thess.3:4,6;

---

1. Monnier, La Notion de l'Apostolat, 1931. (Jesus Matthieu écrit: "Vous direz ..." dans le dénombrement qu'il fait des douze, il rapporte que Simon, dans la pensée, est bien le premier à tous égards.")
2. Martin, J.T., M.A. 1944; Hauck, Neu Verteutschis des Apostolats im N.T., 1933; Monnier, op.cit., 27.

II Cor.13:2,10) though he granted the place of the Spirit to work in their hearts (II Cor.1:24). "Il est remarquable que Paul n'ait assigné aucune limite à l'éntendu des pouvoirs apostoliques."[1] But the spiritual conception of apostleship which Paul held was limitless in possibility and served as a valuable preventive of a stereotyped office. Matthew's tendency to exalt Peter, to view the apostleship as composed of the Twelve who were trained by Jesus, and his very limited use of the word apostle indicate a contrasting tendency to Paul. In the general idea of the function of apostles there is some slight resemblance but the conclusion must be that Matthew and Paul are at variance in their thought of apostles and disciples.

---

1. Monnier op.cit., 42.

II Cor.11:3,13) though he grants the place of the Spirit in work in their hearts (II Cor.3:24). "Il est remarquable que Paul n'ait analysé nulle part la nature des pouvoirs apostoliques."[1] But the spiritual unexpiation of apostleship which Paul held was limited in possibility and served as a valuable preventive of a stereotyped office. Matthew's tendency to small texts, to view the apostleship as composed of the twelve who were trained by Jesus, and his very limited use of the word apostle indicate a contracting tendency to Paul. In the general idea of the function of apostles there is some slight resemblance but the conclusion must be that Matthew and Paul are at variance in their thought of apostles and disciples.

---

1. Monnier op.cit., 42.

8. THE JEWS AND GENTILES

"The gospel of Matthew stands nearest to Jewish life and the Jewish mode of thinking."[1] Israel is Matthew's favorite designation for the Jewish people. "Israel" appears in 8:10 and 8:33; "my people Israel" (2:6); "sons of Israel" (27:9); "tribes of Israel" (19:28); "land of Israel" (2:20); "God of Israel" (15:31); "King of Israel" (27:42). Under this term are the ideas of Israel as a people of God who has a covenant with them.[2] Stanton believes that Matthew, more plainly than Mark or Luke indicates the great spiritual drama which has been wrought out in the gospel history. "These indications are to be found in some favorite expressions and a certain number of sayings peculiar to this gospel, but they suffice to convey to the attentive reader a distinct and strong impression. There were three acts in that drama: (a) the mission of Jesus on earth to the Jewish people as their true king; (b) their rejection of him as a nation; (c) the consequent extension of the preaching of the gospels to the Gentiles after his resurrection."[3]

It is clear that Jesus' ministry was almost entirely to his own people. Matthew regards this as Jesus' conscious aim and purpose. "He shall save his people from their sins"

---

1. Kohler, Jew. Ency., IX, 250, Cf.Allen, St. Matthew LIV-LVI, LXXVII.
2. McNeile, Israel (art.) D.C.G., I, 840, Sanday & Headlam, Romans, 229.
3. Gospels as Hist.Documents,II, 359 f; Cf.Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 587.

6. THE TERM AND MEANING

"The gospel of Matthew stands nearest to Jewish life and the Jewish hope of thinking. Israel is Matthew's favorite designation for the Jewish people. "Israel" appears in 2:20 and 8:33; "my people Israel" (2:6); "sons of Israel" (27:9); "tribes of Israel" (19:28); "lion of Israel" (2:20); "God of Israel" (15:31); "King of Israel" (27:42). Under this term are the ideas of Israel as a people of God who had a covenant with them. Matthew believes that Matthew, more plainly than Mark or Luke indicates the great spiritual drama which has been wrought out in the Jewish ministry. These indications are to be found in more favorite expressions and a certain number of sayings peculiar to this gospel, but they suffice to convey to the attentive reader a distinct and strong impression. There were three acts in that drama: (a) the mission of Jesus on earth to the Jewish people as their true king; (b) their rejection of him as a nation; (c) the consequent extension of the preaching of the gospels to the Gentiles after his resurrection."[1]

It is clear that Jesus' ministry was almost entirely to his own people. Matthew regards this as Jesus' conscious aim and purpose. "He sought more his people from their sins"

---

1. Weiser, Jos. Mor., IX, 290. Cf. Allen, 3. Matthew Lit-Ivi. Lcvii.
2. Weiale, Israel (ed.) N.C.B., 1. 140. Sunday & Headlam, Romans, 2.
3. Tagale an Wist Doctrine, II, 290 f. Cf. Zeine, The Realization, 1.

refers to Israel (1:21). His disciples were to do their work in Jewish territory (10:5). Jesus states to the Canaanitish woman "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15:24). He is moved with compassion for the shepherdless people (9:36). Matthew avoids suggesting that Jesus crossed the borders of Jewish territory. (15: 21-30 cf. Mk.7:24-35; Mt.17:22 cf. Mk.9:30). But the Jewish people have rejected Jesus. "The sons of the kingdom shall be cast out" (8:12; 13:13). Special stress is laid upon the leaders - the Pharisees, chief priests and elders. Here is the only place where a polemic purpose can be substantially found in Matthew. He frequently mentions Pharisees where Mark leaves them out or joins others with them. (e.g. 9:34; 12:24; Mk.3:22) Although Matthew alone reports two tributes paid by Jesus to the way of life taught by Pharisees (5:20; 23:2-3) yet he holds against them a real prejudice. (cf.3:9; 5:20; 6:2,5,16; 15:2-14, all of ch.23)[1] But the Jewish nation as a whole is involved in the claim of responsibility for Jesus' blood. (27:24-25) Therefore their privileges will be taken from them as the parable of the wicked husbandmen shows. (21:41) The gospel is to be preached to the whole world and disciples are to be made of all nations. (24:14; 28:19) These claims are all the more striking when they appear in the most Jewish gospel.

---

1. Cf. Allen, St. Matthew LXXVIII.

refers to Israel (1:21). His disciples were to do their work in Jewish territory (10:5). Jesus states to the Canaanitish woman "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15:24). He is moved with compassion for the shepherdless people (9:36). Matthew avoids suggesting that Jesus crossed the borders of Jewish territory. (15:21-39 cf. Mk.7:24-35; Mt.17:22 cf. Mk.9:30). But the Jewish people have rejected Jesus. "The sons of the kingdom shall be cast out" (8:12; 13:13). Special stress is laid upon the leaders - the Pharisees, chief priests and elders. Here is the only place where a polemic purpose can be substantially found in Matthew. He frequently mentions Pharisees where Mark leaves them out or joins others with them. (e.g. 9:34; 12:24; Mk.3:22) Although Matthew alone reports two tributes paid by Jesus to the way of life taught by Pharisees (5:20; 23:2-3) yet he hurls against them a real prejudice. (cf.3:9; 5:20; 8:2,3,12; 12:2-14, all of Mk.22)[1] But the Jewish nation as a whole is involved in the claim of responsibility for Jesus' blood. (27:24-25) Therefore their privilege will be taken from them as the parable of the wicked husbandmen shows. (21:41) The gospel is to be preached to the whole world and disciples are to be made of all nations. (24:14; 28:19) These claims are all the more striking when they appear in the most Jewish gospel.

---

1. Cf. Allen, St. Matthew lxxviii.

Paul's usual name for his people is Israel: "Israel after the flesh" (I Cor.10:18); "stock of Israel" (Phil.3:5); "commonwealth of Israel" (Eph.2:12); but he notes a distinction in the meaning of the word. "They are not all Israel which are of Israel" (Rom.9:6). There is a spiritual company which is not merely based on physical descent and into this company the Gentiles were grafted (Rom.11:17-18). In one place (Gal.6:16) he writes of the "Israel of God." His meaning is not certain. It has been interpreted as referring to the whole Christian community or to the Jewish part of it. Commentators differ[1] but the best view is that Paul is referring to his own people who are Christians and hence the Israel of God. Paul's philosophy of history, with special reference to Israel appears in Rom.9-11. He had "great sorrow" and "unceasing pain" in his heart over his countrymen. He remembered their privileged position with God in the past and this thought coupled with his own ties of affection and personal relationship is sufficient to make him willing to sacrifice himself for the sake of his Jewish brethren (Rom.9:1-5). He had much personal evidence that the Jews as a people had rejected Jesus as the Messiah. He was certain that this rejection is due to their own waywardness for they had had full and complete knowledge of His message.[2] But God's good purposes, which are greater

---

1. Burton, Galatians, 358-9.
2. Sanday & Headlam, Romans, 342.

than man's finite mind can grasp, have included the calling of the Gentiles, but he has faith that God will ultimately save Israel. "Though their unbelief and consequent alienation from God grows more inveterate day by day, he believes firmly that the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance, and has faith that the distant future will vindicate the unsearchable sources of God's wisdom and mercy."[1]

There is a noticeable difference between Paul and Matthew here. The latter feels that the case is completed against the Jew. The nation is rejected of God (21:42,43; 22:7,23,36,38; 24:2). His heritage of holiness has passed to the Christian believers. His attitude unlike Paul's reflects a time when the breach between Christianity and Judaism has begun to widen perceptibly. This position on the part of Matthew is doubly striking when it is remembered that his readers are evidently Jewish Christians. It is plain from his assumptions that his readers knew Jewish customs, titles, and institutions, and Jewish arrangements of material,[2] and understood his abundant arguments from the Old Testament. But his use of "Jews", (28:15) almost like the Fourth Gospel, shows that he distinguished his Jewish Christian readers from the people of Judaism. The true Israelite must be a follower of Jesus, but though this assumption is implicit in Paul, yet he had hopes in the future

---

1. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, 102; Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 279; Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 241.
2. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 163 f.

than man's finite mind can grasp, have inclined the calling of the Christian. But he has faith that God will ultimately save Israel. "Though their unbelief and consequent alienation from God grows more inveterate day by day, he believes firmly that the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance, and has faith that the distant future will vindicate the unsearchable counsels of God's wisdom and energy."[1]

There is a noticeable difference between Ibsen and Matthew here. The latter feels that the case is completed against the Jew. The nation is rejected of God (21:43,45; 22:7,23,33,38; 24:2). His heritage of holiness has passed to the Christian believers. His attitude unlike Paul's reflects a time when the breach between Christianity and Judaism has begun to widen perceptibly. This position on the part of Matthew is doubly striking when it is remembered that his readers are evidently Jewish Christians. It is plain from his assumptions that his readers have Jewish customs, titles, and institutions, and Jewish arrangements of material,[2] and moreover his abundant arguments from the Old Testament. But his use of "Jew", (Ἰουδαῖος) contrasts with the Fourth Gospel, shows that no distinguished Jew Jewish Christian receives from the people of Judaism. The true Israelite must be a follower of Jesus, but through this assumption is implicit in Paul, yet he can hope in the future

---

1. Dorr, Judaistic Christianity, 108; reissue, The Transitation, 270; Davies, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 141.
2. Harnack, Sayings Logia, 163 f.

for his people to become Christians. Paul mostly defended the right of Gentiles to become Christians apart from subjection to the law. The ultimate logic of his position meant freedom for Jews too (Gal.2:15-19; Eph.2:14-16) but he seldom pushed it that far. Matthew, probably writing not long after the fall of Jerusalem, was compelled to convince Jewish Christians that Christianity was not merely Judaism plus belief in Jesus. It was a world religion.[1] Hence the old regime had ended with the temple. The Messiah was rejected by the Jews and the nation was rejected by God. The kingdom of God was taken from the Jews and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. The Christian people have inherited the kingdom, and the truths of the Old Testament are maintained and fulfilled in Christ. Thus Matthew takes the further step that Paul did not usually take. "The fact that St. Paul the Roman citizen and Christian Apostle, was five times ignominiously beaten in Jewish synagogues by order of the Jewish officials (II Cor.11:24 of Dent.25:3) is clear evidence that he did not regard himself on the ground of his conversion to Christianity as having ceased to be a Jew. On the contrary, he informs us himself that he became to the Jews as a Jew that he might gain Jews to the new faith which he conceives as the true form which the Jewish religion ought

---

1. Burton and Willoughby, Intro. to Gospels, 20.

for Ain people to become Christians. Paul mostly defended the right of Gentiles to become Christians apart from subjection to the law. The climatic logic of his position meant freedom for Jews too (Gal.4:1-5; 3:24-4:6) but he rather pushed it that far. Perhaps, strangely writing not long after the fall of Jerusalem, was compelled to convince Jewish Christians that Christianity was not merely Judaism plus belief in Jesus. It was a world religion. Hence the old regime had ended with the temple. The Jewish was rejected by God along with the nation was replaced by God. The kingdom of God was taken from the Jews and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. The Christian people have inherited the kingdom, and the promise of the Old Testament are maintained and fulfilled in Christ. Thus Matthew takes the further step that Paul did not usually take. "The fact that it, that the human division and Christian apostle, was free times ignominiously beaten in Jewish synagogues by order of the Jewish officials (II Cor.11:24 of Matt.23:3) is clear evidence that he did not regard himself on the ground of his conversion to Christianity as having ceased to be a Jew. On the contrary, he informs us himself that he judaize to the Jew as a Jew that he might gain; yes to the new faith which he conceived as the true form which the Jewish religion ought

---

1. Burton and Willoughby. Intro. to Romans, 20.

now to assume."[1]

Directly related to Paul's view of the Jews is his attitude toward the Gentiles. He believed the Jew had had a special revelation from God (Rom.3:1-2). This brought added responsibility and increased condemnation for disobedience (Rom.2:9). But though salvation was to the Jew first, it was also for the Greek (Rom.1:16). The Gentiles had the law of conscience in their hearts. They had become degraded in spite of their knowledge of good. (Rom.1:21-23). The rejection of the gospel by the Jews had only made it available much sooner for Gentiles. And the very acceptance of salvation by Gentiles would provoke Israel to a like acceptance. (Rom.11:14) As many as have put on Christ and become new creatures have reached a plane of living, as sons of God, where there is neither Jew nor Greek. (Gal.3:25-29) Paul has frequently been called the apostle of the Gentiles but his thought included both Jews and Gentiles. His was a universal gospel. He believed in a God of both Jews and

---

1. Rawlinson, N.T.Doct.of Christ, 103-104; Gebhardt (Z.K.W., VI, 508) points out that where Paul speaks of the judgment of Israel he has no warning of the coming of the Lord (I Thess.2:14) and where he writes the coming, there is nothing about the Judgment of Israel, therefore the conclusion is: "erst die Katastrophe über Israel hereinbrach, da deutete sich die christliche Gemeinde die nahenden Ereignisse in der Weise dahin, dass Israel durch ein Strafgericht Gottes zur Gesammtbekehrung geführt werden und dann der Herr der Herrlichkeit erschienen, richten und das Reich Gottes herstellen werde, und so wurden die Worte Jesu (Mt.24:1-28) und (24:29) ein Ganzes."

new to assume.[1]

Directly related to Paul's view of the Jews is his attitude toward the Gentiles. He believed the Jew had a special revelation from God (Rom.3:1-2). This brought added responsibility and increased condemnation for disobedience (Rom.2:9). But though salvation was to the Jew first, it was also for the Greek (Rom.1:16). The Gentiles had the law of conscience in their hearts. They had become degraded in spite of their knowledge of good. (Rom.1:21-32). The rejection of the gospel by the Jews had only made it available much sooner for Gentiles. And the very acceptance of salvation by Gentiles would provoke Israel to a like acceptance. (Rom.11:14) As many as have put on Christ and become new creatures have received a place of living, as sons of God, where there is neither Jew nor Greek. (Gal.3:26-29) Paul has frequently been called the apostle of the Gentiles but his thought included both Jews and Gentiles. His was a universal gospel. He believed in a God of both Jews and

---

1. Hamilton, N.T.Dict.of Christ, 102-106; Schmerk T.W.N.T., VI, 366) points out that where Paul speaks of the judgment of Israel he has no warning of the coming of the Lord (I Thess.2:14) and where he writes the coming, there is nothing about the judgment of Israel. Therefore the conclusion is: "Erst die Kreuzestode über Israel hereinbrach, da deutete sich die christliche Gemeinde die mächtigen Kreignisse in der Welt damit, dass Israel durch ein Strafgericht Gottes zur Besinnung bekehrung reifbar werden und dann der Herr der Herrlichkeit erscheinen, richten und das Reich Gottes errichten werde, und so wurden die Worte Jesu (Mt.24:1-29) und (24:30) ein Canon."

Gentiles (Rom.3:29), there was no distinction in his thinking about men's need for salvation. (Rom.3:22) God will justify by faith both circumcision and uncircumcision (Rom.3:30). "There is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him." (Rom.10:12) "Unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (I Cor.1:24). "For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks (Cor.12:13). Blessings came upon the Gentiles through the cross (Gal.3:14). Gentiles are fellow-heirs of the promise in Christ Jesus (Eph. 3:6). The wall between the circumcision and uncircumcision is broken down by Christ and they are one - a new man (Eph. 2:11-15). In the new man there cannot be "Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all and in all." (Col.3:11).[1]

When Matthew refers to the Gentiles he shows his Jewish attitude. When he advised that the unsuccessful settlement of disputes should result in the offending, unforgiving one being regarded as a "Gentile and publican" (18:17) he can hardly have been writing for Gentile readers. When the Gentiles are used as illustrations (5:47; 6:7,32)

---

1. Hamilton, The People of God, II, 56 "In other words, the Gentiles are, through faith in Jesus, admitted into the enjoyment of the promises made to Abraham on the same terms as the Jews themselves."

Gentiles (Rom.3:29). There was no distinction in his thinking about man's need for salvation. (Rom.3:22) One will justify by faith both circumcision and uncircumcision (Rom.3:30). "There is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him." (Rom.10:12) "Unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (I Cor.1:24). "For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks (Cor.12:13). Blessings come upon the Gentiles through the cross (Gal.3:14). Gentiles are fellow-heirs of the promise in Christ Jesus (Eph. 3:6). The wall between the circumcision and uncircumcision is broken down by Christ and they are one - a new man (Eph. 2:11-15). In the new man there cannot be "Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all and in all." (Col.3:11).[1]

When Matthew refers to the Gentiles he shows his Jewish attitude. Then he advised that the unsuccessful settlement of disputes should result in the offending, unforgiving one being regarded as a "Gentile and publican" (18:17) As man hardly have been writing for Gentile readers, when the Gentiles are used as illustrations (5:47; 6:7,32)

---

1. Moulton, The Ethics of God, 111. Or "In other words, the Gentiles are, through faith in Jesus, admitted into the enjoyment of the promises made to Abraham on the same terms as the Jews themselves."

the usage is similar to the usual Jewish attitude of regarding Gentiles as heathen and unbelievers. But Paul has the same usage (I Cor.5:1; 10:20; 12:2). In these cases the Gentiles have a religious rather than a racial meaning. But Matthew has another viewpoint curiously interwoven. He foreshadows the downfall of Judaism. (8:11,12; 12:38-45; 21:43; 22:1-14; 23:35,36; 24:2; 27:25) He has a universal outlook also. Many shall come from the east and the west and sit "with Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God" (8:11). "The field is the world" (13:38). "The last shall be first" (20:16). "The kingdom of God....shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (21:43). All nations are to be evangelized (28:19). Pfleiderer, who regards Matthew as "ecclesiastical gospel-harmony", thinks that this "Christian universalism has a different basis from that which Paul gives it, a basis not doctrinal but ethical; it rests upon the belief in the universal authority of the will of God which was made known by Christ, and upon the universal obligation and enablement, of all men to fulfill it by doing good, by works of love in which we serve Christ himself, as is shown in the impressive picture of the final judgment."[1] But Matthew's universalism does not appear based on any foundation essentially different from Paul's. Both are ethical rather than doctrinal.

---

1. Prim. Christianity, III, 379.

the dogma is similar to the usual Jewish criticism of recognizing Gentiles as heathen and unbelievers. But Paul has the same image (1 Cor.8:11; 10:20; 12:2). In three cases the Gentiles have a religious rather than a moral meaning. But Matthew has another viewpoint curiously interwoven. He foresees the downfall of Gentiles (4:13,15; 12:20-21; 21:43; 22:1-14; 23:34,35; 24:2; 27:25). He has a universal outlook also. Many shall come from the east and the west and sit with Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God" (8:11). "The field is the world" (13:38). "The last shall be first" (20:16). "The kingdom of God....shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (21:43). All nations are to be evangelized (28:19). Whatever, who regards Matthew as "nationalistic and legal-minded", thinks that this "Christian universalism has a different basis from that which Paul gives it, a basis not doctrinal but ethical: it rests upon the belief in the universal authority of the will of God which was made known by Christ, and upon the universal obligation and endeavour, of all men to fulfill it by doing good, by works of love in which we serve Christ himself, as is shown in the impressive picture of the final judgment."[1] But Matthew's universalism does not appear based on any foundation essentially different from Paul's. Both are ethical rather than doctrinal.

---

1. Bryan, Christianity, iii, 374.

The evidence indicates that in parts Matthew is more Jewish than Paul. This may be due to the fact that he is writing for Jewish Christian readers. Toward the Gentiles Matthew often takes the usual Jewish attitude which regarded them as inferior. On the other hand, Matthew goes beyond Paul in his rejection of the Jewish people, especially the leaders. This may be because Matthew probably wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem and at a time when sharper lines were being drawn between Judaism and Christianity. In the universality of salvation for all men he is like Paul. Both agree that salvation is first for Jew and then for Gentile. That Matthew's universalism is influenced by Paul's ideas seems probable and his narrower limited view may be due to earlier ideas which seem to stand side by side with later ones in Matthew. Paul was not the originator of the ideas of salvation for both Jew and Gentile but he took the implicit teachings of Jesus which he found in early Christian circles and almost alone broke the bonds of legalistic Judaism. His influence at this point, whether clear or implied, has made its impress on subsequent writers because it became an emphasized part of the genius of Christianity.

The evidence indicates that in parts Matthew is more Jewish than Paul. This may be due to the fact that he is writing for Jewish Christian readers. Toward the Gentiles Matthew often taken the usual Jewish attitude which regarded them as inferior. On the other hand, Matthew goes beyond Paul in his rejection of the Jewish people, especially the leaders. This may be because Matthew probably wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem and at a time when sharper lines were being drawn between Judaism and Christianity. In the universality of salvation for all men he is like Paul. Both agree that salvation is first for Jew and then for Gentile. That Matthew's universalism is influenced by Paul's ideas seems probable and his narrower limited view may be due to earlier ideas which seem to stand side by side with later ones in Matthew. Paul was not the originator of the ideas of salvation for both Jew and Gentile but he took the implicit teachings of Jesus which he found in early Christian circles and almost alone broke the bonds of legalistic Judaism. His influence at this point, whether clear or implied, has made its impress on subsequent writers because it became an emphasized part of the genius of Christianity.

9. USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

There are four writers of the New Testament who are outstanding in their use of the Old Testament - Matthew, Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John. The first two provide the subject material for this section. Both Matthew and Paul, as educated Jews, knew the Old Testament very well and both deal masterfully with the problem of relating it to their newer faith in Christ. Both quote so extensively that the lists can only be summarized here. Taking for comparison the count as given by four different authorities[1] the following table was secured:

	Turpie	Swete	Toy	W. &. H.
O. T. Quotations in Rom.	56	42	60	70
" " I Cor.	19	13	20	29
" " II Cor.	9	6	14	20
" " Gal.	10	10	10	13
" " Eph.	4	5	12	16
" " I Thess.	0	0	4	7
" " II Thess.	0	0	1	7
" " Phil.	0	0	1	6
" " Col.	0	0	2	4
" " Philem.	0	0	0	0
	98	76	124	172
	Massebieau[2]		McNeile[3]	
" " Mt. 45	41	40	43	93

1. Turpie, N.T.View of the Old,1; Toy, Quot.in N.T.,289-292; Westcott & Hart, N.T.in Greek, 587-589; Swete, Intro.to O.T. in Greek, 386-391; Sanday and Headlam, (Rom.302) give a total of 84 quotations in Paul.
2. Examen des Citations selon Mt., 50.
3. Matthew, XXXIII-IV. Besides the direct quotations, McNeile also finds 76 allusions to the Old Testament.

8. USE BY THE OLD TESTAMENT

There are four writers of the New Testament who are outstanding in their use of the Old Testament - Matthew, Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John. The first two provide the richest material for this section. Both Matthew and Paul, as educated Jews, knew the Old Testament very well and both dealt constantly with the problem of relating it to their newer faith in Christ. Both quote so extensively that the table can only be summarized here. Taking for comparison the count as given by four different authorities[1] the following table was accurate:

	Turgie	Swete	Toy	N. & H.
O. T. Quotations in Mat.	36	42	43	37
" " I Cor.	13	14	20	22
" " II Cor.	9	6	14	20
" " Gal.	10	10	10	13
" " Eph.	4	3	12	16
" " I Thess.	0	0	4	7
" " II Thess.	0	0	1	3
" " Phil.	0	0	1	6
" " Col.	0	0	2	4
" " Philem.	0	0	0	0
	86	76	124	172

	Mazzeleso[2]		Moffatt[3]	
" " Mt.	45	41	40	43

---

1. Turgie, W.T.View of the Old, 1; Toy, Quot. in N.T., 298-299; Swete & Hart, N.T. in Greek, 397-398; Swete, Intro. to O.T. in Greek, 388-391; Hastey and Hoffman, (Com. 205) give a total of 64 quotations in Paul.
2. Mazzeleso des Citations selon Mt., 30.
3. Moffatt, Intro. 377-IV. Besides the direct quotations, Moffatt also finds 75 allusions to the Old Testament.

Paul usually quoted (seven times out of eight) from the Septuagint,[1] mostly from memory. Occasionally his quotations show derivation from a Hebrew text or some distinct version. He seldom uses Rabbinic legends and uncanonical Jewish literature. He introduces his quotations by various formulas "as it is written", or "the Scripture saith" which were in common Jewish use. He uses γέγραπται the most, a total of thirty-six times. He frequently mentions the name of the book. He combines different passages from different Old Testament books in order to prove his argument. His quotations are not long as in Hebrews. His stringing a series of passages together is evidence of his Rabbinic training, but whether he used a written anthology is still in doubt.[2] He takes his quotations from the Pentateuch, Psalms and Prophets mainly. His quotations are nearly all found in Romans, the Corinthian letters and Galatians, letters written when the Judaistic struggle was at its height.[3]

Turning now from his methods of quoting to his interpretation of the Old Testament it is observable that "in the hortatory parts of his epistles, the citations are

---

1. Sanday & Headlam, Rom.,302f; Thackeray, Relat.of St.Paul to Contemp.Jew.Thought 303f; Gilbert, Interp.of Bible, 74f; Vollmer, Die Altestamentliche Citate, 9f; Toy, Quot.in N.T., Xf.
2. Vollmer (op.cit.36f.) thinks that Paul uses a Hebrew collection; Thackeray (op.cit.185) will not admit it; Sanday and Headlam, (Rom.302) think he learned the method of the Rabbis.
3. Clemen. op.cit., 159.

Paul usually quotes (seven times out of eight) from the Septuagint,[1] mostly from memory. Occasionally his quotations show derivation from a Hebrew text or some distinct version. He seldom uses Rabbinic legends and unchronological Jewish literature. He introduces his quotations by various formulas "as it is written", or "the Scriptures saith" which were in common Jewish use. He uses Hebrew the most, a total of thirty-six times. He frequently mentions the name of the book. He co binds different passages from different Old Testament books in order to prove his argument. His quotations are not long as in Hebrews. His stringing a series of passages together is evidence of his Rabbinic training, but whether he used a written anthology is still in doubt.[2] He takes his quotations from the Pentateuch, Psalms and Prophets mainly. His quotations are nearly all found in Romans, the Corinthian letters and Galatians, letters written when the judaistic struggle was at its height.[3]

Turning now from his methods of quoting to his interpretation of the Old Testament it is observable that in the hortatory parts of his epistles, the citations are

---

1. Sanday & Headlam, Rom., 1902: Thackeray, Relat. of St. Paul to Contemp. Jew. Thought 1900; Gilbert, Inter. of Bible, 761; Volmer, Die alttestamentlichen Citate, 87; Toy, Quot. in N.T., XX.
2. Volmer (op.cit.387.) thinks that Paul uses a Hebrew collection: Thackeray (op.cit.158) w.it not edit. it; Sanday and Headlam, (Rom.292) think he learned the method of the Rabbis.
3. Clemen, op.cit., 128.

commonly literal and simple; there is no occasion for exegesis."[1] But if he has an argument to establish he uses Rabbinical methods to the utmost. To hold that he followed the "pneumatische in Gegensatz zum grammatischen" sense is to overlook too many of his historical references.[2] It is true that usually his quotations are not in accord with modern ideas of quoting. He quotes without regard for context or circumstances in which the original words were written.[3] He follows words rather than ideas. He even has quotations which are used to prove points in a sense directly opposite to what they originally had. He uses passages for Messianic proof when in the Old Testament they are not Messianic. He saw the earlier authors as men who foreshadowed the coming of the Messiah. In a few instances he used the allegorical method. (I Cor.9:9, 10:1-11, Gal.4:21-31). The last named passage is the most highly allegorical and Gilbert thinks it is his only allegorical passage.[4] Paul is careful to show that since God promised Abraham blessings which had reference to a "seed" who are the spiritual not physical descendants of Abraham because they have faith and obtain righteousness. They are "children of promise" as opposed to "children of flesh" (Rom.9:8ff. Gal.4:23-29). The allegory as

---

1. Toy, op.cit.,XXXVI.
2. Vollmer, op.cit.,57.
3. Sanday & Headlam, op.cit., 303.
4. op.cit., 81.

economy literal and single; there is no estimate for exegesis.[4] But if he has an argument to establish he uses Rabbinical methods to the utmost. To hold that he followed the "pneumatics in Gegenwart und gesellschaften" seems as to overlook too many of his historical references.[5] It is true that usually his quotations are not in accord with modern ideas of quoting. He quotes without regard for context or circumstances in which the original words were written.[6] He follows words rather than ideas. He even has quotations which are used to prove points in a sense directly opposite to what they originally had. He uses passages for Messianic proof when in the Old Testament they are not Messianic. He saw the earlier authors as men who foreshadowed the coming of the Messiah. In a few instances he used the allegorical method. (I Cor. 9:9, 10:1-11, Gal.4:21-31). The last named passage is the most highly allegorical and Gilbert thinks it is his only allegorical passage.[7] Care is careful to show that since God promised Abraham blessings which had reference to a "seed" and are the spiritual not physical descendants of Abraham because they have faith and obtain righteousness. They are "children of promise" as opposed to children of flesh. (Rom.4:16, Gal.4:28). The allegory as

---

1. Gay, op.cit., 27.
2. Vollmer, op.cit., 30.
3. Stanley A. Ranglas, op.cit., 245.
4. op.cit., 61.

set forth by McNeile[1] may be represented as follows:

Hagar	Sarah
Ishmael born after the flesh	Isaac born after the Spirit
The Old Covenant at Sinai	The New Covenant
The Law	The Promise
The earthly Jerusalem	Jerusalem that is above
Slavery	Freedom

Paul's interpretation of the Old Testament was conditioned by the customs and thought of his day, but he rightly interpreted the spirit of the Old Testament writings. He could reject Old Testament statutes as his Galatian letter proves. He "did not reject the Old Testament in toto."[2] He took a discriminative attitude toward it. He recognized its value as a whole. He linked the Christian religion historically with that of the Old Testament, and hence rendered Christianity a great service by providing historical continuity for it. Gilbert who takes an unappreciative attitude toward "Paul and his Bible" holds that his quotations are marked (1) by a literalism which misses the historical sense (Cf.I Cor.11:7-9 = Gen.1:27, I Cor.15:26-27 = Ps.8:6, Gal.3:13 = Deut.21:22-3, Gal.3:16 = Gen.13:14-16) and (2) by fancifulness, (I Cor.9:9-10 = Deut.25:4, I Cor.10:1-4 = Ex.14:16, 17; II Cor.3:7,8,12-16 = Ex.34:29,30,35; Eph.4:8-19 = Ps.68:18, Rom.5:12-21, I Cor.15:22,45 = Gen.2:17, 3:17-19.)[3]

Matthew's use of the Old Testament provides some

---

1. St.Paul,297, Cf. Burton, Gal.,261-262; Moffatt, Approach to N.T., 134-141.
2. Burton, Gal., LXIf.
3. Cf. Jesus and His Bible, 127-152.

Barth's contrast between the Old Testament and the Spirit of Christ by Schelling[1] may be represented as follows:

Hinger	Barth
Literal Torah after the Fall	Torah after the Spirit
The Old Covenant at Sinai	The New Covenant
Law	The Trinity
The earthly Jerusalem	Jerusalem that is Above
Slavery	Freedom

Paul's interpretation of the Old Testament was conditioned by the customs and thought of his day, but he rightly interpreted the spirit of the Old Testament writings. He could reject Old Testament statutes as his relation latter proves. He did not reject the Old Testament in toto.[2] He took a discriminative attitude toward it. He recognized its value as a whole. He linked the Christian religion historically with that of the Old Testament, and hence rendered Christianity a great service by providing historical continuity for it. Hilbert who takes an unsympathetic attitude toward Paul and his Bible[3] holds that his quotations are marked (1) by a literalism which misses the Christical sense (Gr. 1 Cor.11:7-9 = Gen.1:27, 1 Cor.10:1-22 = Ex.3:6, Gal.4:24 = Isaiah.51:2-3, Gal.3:16 = Gen.12:13-16) and (2) by tendentiousness, (1 Cor.9:9-10 = Deut.25:4, 1 Cor.10:1-4 = Ex.14:4, 17:6, 1 Cor.10:10 = Ex.32:6, 35, 2Sm.24:10, Num.21:5-10 = Ex.5:1, 16, Num.9:12-21, 1 Cor.10:26,28 = Gen.1:10, 2:17-18.[4]

Schlatter's use of the Old Testament provides some

---

1. Gr. Tend.267. Cf. Burton, Gal., 301-322; Moffatt, Approach to N.T., 124-141.
2. Burton, Gal., 1212.
3. Cf. Jesus and His Bible, 127-132.

puzzling problems.[1] Burkitt[2] believes that "it cannot be said that the early Christians in general, or the First Evangelist in particular were very successful in their use of the Old Testament." This is hardly a fair judgment because by the standards of his day and in respect to the needs of his Jewish Christian readers Matthew did use the Old Testament in an effective way. Matthew differs from Paul in increased use of Hebrew and Aramaic quotations. There are differences of opinion about whether he used Hebrew or Aramaic. Toy and Zahn favor an Aramaic usage while Massebieau, Swete, and Hawkins think he used Hebrew. In general, Matthew's quotations can be divided up into those (1) which are only in Matthew, (2) those which are in common with Mark and those in common with Luke, or they may be classified (1) as those which the Evangelist quotes, (2) those which Jesus quotes and (3) those (two) by Jews and (4) one by John Baptist. Generally, the quotations which agree with other Synoptists are related to the Septuagint; those by Matthew alone are Hebrew or Aramaic. The latter provide the problem. They are usually introduced by a formula "that it might be fulfilled". (1:23, 2:15,18,23; 4:15,16; 8:17; 12:18-21; 13:35; 21:5; 27:9-10).

---

1. Cf. Massebieau, op.cit.,47,77,93. Zahn, Intro.to N.T.,II, 579f, LaGrange, St. Matthieu,CXVII-CXXIV; Swete, op.cit., 391-405; Burkitt, Gospel Hist., 125,202; Hawkins, Horae Syn., 154-158; Toy,op.cit.,XXXII-XXXIII; Moffatt, Intro-to N.T., 258.
2. Burkitt, op.cit., 202.

practicing problems.[1] Burritt[2] believes that it cannot be said that the early Christians in general, or the First Evangelist in particular were very successful in their use of the Old Testament.[3] This is partly a fair judgment because by the standards of his day and in respect to the needs of his Jewish Christian readers Matthew did use the Old Testament in an effective way. Matthew differs from Paul in increased use of Hebrew and Greek quotations. There are differences of opinion about whether he used Hebrew or Greek. Toy and Zahn favor an Greek usage while Rosenblum, Stein, and Hawkins think he used Hebrew. In general, Matthew's quotations can be divided up into three (1) which are only in Hebrew, (2) those which are in common with Mark and those in common with Luke, or they may be classified (1) as those which the Evangelist quotes, (2) those which Jesus quotes and (3) those (two) by Jews and (2) one by John Baptist. Generally, the quotations which agree with other Gospelists are related to the Synoptics; those by Matthew alone are Hebrew or Greek. The latter provide the problem. They are usually introduced by a formula "that it might be fulfilled". (1:22, 2:15,16,23; 4:14,16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35; 21:4; 27:9-10).

---

1. Cf. Rosenblum, op.cit., 27,77,93. Zahn, Intro. to N.T., 87-97. Lagrange, St. Matthew, CXVII-CXXIV. Beare, op.cit., 421-422; Burrit, Gospel Hist., 123-124; Hawkins, Horae Syn., 124-126; Toy, op.cit., XXXII-XXXIII; Moffatt, Intro. to N.T., 229.
2. Burrit, op.cit., 326.

This formula is not used by Paul. These passages are for the purpose of proving Jesus' Messiahship and are mechanically literal. Massebieau and Hawkins think they indicate a double authorship. Zahn believes they can be accounted for by assuming that Matthew is a Greek translation of an Aramaic original. Allen's solution is best. He holds that Matthew is a unity and that the writer in his quotations from Mark or in quotations ascribed to Christ has assimilated to the Septuagint and that in the special passages he has given renderings from the Hebrew which were borrowed by him from an oral tradition of his time or possibly from a Greek document of fulfilled prophecies which he was using side by side with Mark.[1] It must also be remembered that Matthew's quotations like Paul's were largely from memory and that he used composite passages without regard to context. He does not use allegory. He uses mainly the Law, Prophets and Psalms for sources. But he differs from Paul in confining his quotations referring to Jesus to the Prophets and Psalms. Paul includes the Pentateuch. There is a general distinction found between the apologetic purposes of his own catena of quotations and the religious purposes of the quotations attributed to Jesus. In those quotations which are credited to Jesus it is evident that he draws from the Old Testament in a direct

---

1. Old Testament Quot. in Mt.; Exp.Times, XII,285; St.Matt., LXIII, for Mt. modifications of Mk. cf. Stephenson, The O.T.Quotations peculiar to Mt. J.T.S., XX, 79, 227-229.

This formula is not used by Paul. These passages are for the purpose of proving Jesus' messianicity and are mechanically literal. Ben-Sirach and Baruch think they indicate a double authorship. Cohn believes they can be accounted for by assuming that Matthew is a crude translation of an Aramaic original. Allen's solution is best. He holds that Matthew is a unity and that the writer in his quotations from Mark or in quotations ascribed to Q that has been indicated to the Septuagint and that in the special passages he has given readings from the Hebrew which were borrowed by him from an oral tradition of his time or possibly from a Greek manuscript of fulfillment prophecies which he was using side by side with Mark.[1] It must also be remembered that Matthew's quotations like Paul's were largely from memory and that he used composite passages without regard to context. He does not use allegory. He uses mainly the law, Prophets and Psalms for sources. But he differs from Paul in combining his quotations referring to Jesus to the Prophets and Psalms. Paul includes the Pentateuch. There is a general distinction found between the apologetic purposes of his own catena of quotations and the religious purposes of the quotations attributed to Jesus. In these quotations which are credited to Jesus it is evident that he draws from the Old Testament in a direct

---

1. Old Testament Quot. in Mt.; Exp. Times, XII, 255; St. Matt., Exeg. for Mt. modifications of Mk. of. Bretschneider, The O.T. Quotations peculiar to St. J.B., XX, 79, 227-230.

and authoritative manner. His quotations are not evidences of afterthought and reflection like the Evangelist's but are due to circumstances which he faced and to immediate problems before him. He never stresses the external correspondence of events and prophecy but rather points out underlying principles. But in the quotations by Matthew himself it is clear that he cites the Old Testament more in accordance with the Rabbinic schools, who applied a prophet's words not only to his own time but to the future as well and who also regarded events and sayings once intended for the nation, as applicable to the Messiah.[1] Matthew's structure of his narrative is affected by his writing to focus attention on a citation from the Old Testament. The details of his narrative are made to accord with prophecy; e.g. Mk.9:2 (colt) = Mt.22:2 (ass and colt) = Zech.9:9 (ass and colt); Mk.14:11 (money) = Mt.26:15 (30 pieces of silver) = Zech.11:12. Indirect allusions are evident, e.g. Jesus and Israel both sojourn in the wilderness, Jesus and Moses both give the Law from a mountain. Matthew's favorite introductory formula "that it might be fulfilled" shows how he thought of the Messiah as completing the eternal purposes of God. His stress on those aspects of Jesus' life which were omitted from the popular Messianic conceptions, e.g. his humble origin, his meekness and suffering, his Nazarene home, show that Matthew

---

1. McNeile, Camb.Bib.Essays,221. "It is in their ex post facto character the Evangelists differ from His."

and authoritative manner. His quotations are not evidence of afterthought and reflection like the Evangelists's but are due to circumstances which he faces and to immediate problems before him. He never stresses the external correspondence of events and prophecy but rather points out underlying principles. Not in the quotations by Matthew himself it is clear that he cites the Old Testament more in accordance with the Rabbinic canons, who applied a prophet's words not only to his own time but to the future as well and who also regarded events and sayings once intended for the nation, as applicable to the Messiah.[1] Matthew's attitude of his narrative is affected by his writing to focus attention on a citation from the Old Testament. The details of his narrative are made to accord with prophecy: e.g. Mt.27:9 (coin) = Zech.11:12 (ass and colt) = Zech.9:9 (ass and colt); Mt.26:15 (money) = Zech.11:12 (30 pieces of silver) = Exod.21:32. Indirect allusions are evident, e.g. Jesus and Israel both sojourn in the wilderness. Jesus and Moses both give the law from a mountain. Matthew's favorite introductory formula "that it might be fulfilled" shows how he thought of the Messiah as completing the eternal purposes of God. His stress on those aspects of Jesus' life which were omitted from the popular Messianic conceptions, e.g. His humble origin, His meekness and suffering, His Kingship alone, show that Matthew

---

1. McNeile, Comm. Gt. Matthew, xxi. "It is in their ex post facto character the Evangelists differ from Mis."

is determined to have Old Testament proof for his Messiah.[1] He uses a wide variety of introductory phrases, many more than Paul. His inexactness of quotation has occasioned considerable questioning. His general purposes in quoting appear to be (1) to emphasize Jesus as the Messianic king who was foretold in the Old Testament. In this emphasis he goes beyond Paul. (2) He regards Jesus as the fulfillment of Jewish hopes. (3) He uses the great truths of the Hebrew faith to illustrate the truths of the new faith. (4) In some cases the old commands are quoted to show that Jesus taught their spiritual fulfillment. (5) The Law is quoted as an authority in religious matters.

Among the many quotations by Paul and Matthew there are strikingly few which are found in both. Such double usage is usually in regard to some ethical teaching that was common knowledge (Mt.5:21,27; 15:4 = Rom.7:7, 13:9; Eph.6:2 = Exod.20:12-17) like the ten commandments. (Mt.5: 43; 19:19; 22:39 = Rom.13:9, Gal.5:14 = Lev.19:18). There is a common reference to the judgment but in Matthew (16:27) it is the Son of Man who shall render unto each man according to his deeds (πρᾶξιν), while in Romans (2:6) (Prov.24:12) it is the judgment of God who will render to every man according to his works. (ἔργα) Matthew follows the Aramaic and Romans the Septuagint. The nearest parallel is Mt.18:16

---

1. Cf. Micklem, Matthew, XXXI-II.

is determined to have Old Testament proof for his teaching. He uses a wide variety of introductory phrases, many more than Paul. His frequency of quotation has occasioned considerable questioning. His general purposes in quoting appear to be (1) to emphasize Jesus as the Messianic King who was foretold in the Old Testament. In this emphasis he goes beyond Paul. (2) He reports Jesus as the fulfillment of Jewish hopes. (3) He uses the great truths of the Fathers faith to illustrate the truths of the new faith. (4) In some cases the old commands are quoted to show that Jesus taught their spiritual fulfillment. (5) The law is quoted as an authority in religious matters.

Among the many quotations by Paul and Matthew there are difficulty for which are found in both. Such double usage is unlikely in regard to some ethical teaching that was common knowledge (Mt.5:21,27; 19:4 = Rom.7:7, 13:9; Mt.5:3 = Rom.12:17-17) like the ten commandments. (Mt.5; 4:; 19:18; 22:39 = Rom.13:9, Gal.5:14 = Lev.19:18). There is a common reference to the judgment but in Matthew 16:27 it is the Son of Man who shall render unto each according to his deeds ("work"), while in Romans (2:6) (Prov.24:12) it is the judgment of God who will render to every man according to his works. (Eve.) Matthew follows the Greek and Roman idea of judgment. The nearest parallel is Mt.13:14

---

1. Cf. Kinkiam, Matthew, xxxi-ii.

where in troubles between church brethren there shall be evidence established at the "mouth of two witnesses or three" and II Cor.13 (= Deut.19:15) where the wording is very nearly the same. But this was the well known Jewish rule about witnesses. It could be argued that Paul was dealing with church offenders and that Matthew uses the same procedure that Paul undertook but this is an isolated case of coincidence, not dependence. There are some similarities in Pauline and Matthean usage of the Old Testament, such as interest in fulfillment of prophecy and freedom in quoting, but these are due only to the literary customs of their day. The differences are so great as to prove that on this point Matthew was an independent worker who prepared his gospel so that Christian converts might have both the Law and Christ, while "Paul no doubt used Old Testament prophecies as part of an apologetic to Gentiles as well as Jews (Rom.1:2) but he certainly did not give his converts instruction in the Law as the first step in their Christian instruction."[1] He had a new salvation in Christ.

---

1. Easton, Pauline Theol. and Hellenism, A.J.T.,XXI,3,362.

where in treating between church brethren there should be evidence established at the "mouth of two witnesses or three" and II Cor.13 (= Deut.19:15) where the wording is very nearly the same. But this was the well known Jewish rule about witnesses. It could be argued that Paul was dealing with church officebearers and that Matthew uses the same procedure that Paul understood but this is an isolated case of continuidence, not dependence. There are some similarities in Paulinn and Matthean usage of the Old Testament, such as interest in fulfillment of prophecy and freedom in quoting. But these are due only to the literary customs of their day. The differences are so great as to prove that on this point Matthew was an independent worker who presented his gospel so that Christian converts might have both the Law and Christ, while Paul no doubt used Old Testament prophecies as part of an apologetic to Gentiles as well as Jews (Rom.1:2) but he certainly did not give his converts instruction in the Law as the first step in their Christian instruction."[1] He had a new salvation in Christ.

---

1. Easton, Pauline Texts, and Heitmann, A.T.,XXI,c,386.

10. ETHICAL OUTLOOK

"The moral personality of Paul is reflected in hundreds of ethical commands and words of advice. His letters are a witness how wide and how manly his ethical ideal was; they are full of detached moral exhortations. problems of the day came before this great pastor in plenty, and he settled them all from the certainty of his fellowship with Christ, and always in the light of the gospel. But no one should make of these scattered detached sayings a Pauline 'system of ethics' and we must most certainly avoid the mistake of saying that things which happen not to be mentioned in the letters lay 'beyond his ethical horizon.' Here too we must repeat, the letters are fragments. Nor is Paul a professed ethical theorist; like other great spiritual guides, in important questions of ethical principles he felt no necessity to harmonize his principles with one another: everything comes from God, from Christ, through the Spirit, and yet Paul believes man is capable of everything."[1] Paul's refusal to set forth any systematic treatment of ethics is noteworthy in view of the cardinal virtues taught from the time of Plato and Aristotle and which were commonly listed in the Greek thinking of Paul's day. Fortitude, temperance, prudence, and justice were familiarly known. But

---

1. Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, 257-8.

Paul's emancipation from the Law had taught him that the "letter killeth but the Spirit maketh alive." He wanted no written code because the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Rom.8:2) made him free. This life in Christ was the norm for ethical conduct. Both Paul and Matthew were dealing with definite situations. Both were related to the growing church and both wrote with the church needs in view. "Ecclesiastic is a not unsuitable epithet for this first Gospel... It impresses by its clear arrangement, its massive dignity, its liturgical movement, no book more fit for reading in church services."[1] This does not mean that Matthew wrote didactically rather than historically. Jacoby's statement about the Synoptic writers is true. "Sie wollen zuverlässige Geschichte schreiben, sie schöpfen aus der Überlieferung und aus schriftlichen Quellen. Sie sind nicht Tendenzschriftsteller. Sie verknüpfen ihre individuelle Anschauung mit der geschichtlichen Darstellung; unwillkürlich wird jene auch mehrfach diese beeinflusst haben, aber von einer bewussten tendenziösen Geschichtsschreibung sind sie weit entfernt."[2] Paul and Matthew had the organized community of Christian believers before them and it is inevitable that their ethical statements should deal with a practical situation.

There is little question that Paul is one with

---

1. Nairne, The Faith of the New Testament, 45-6.
2. Neutestamentliche Ethik, 409.

Paul's emancipation from the law had taught him that the "letter killeth but the Spirit maketh alive." He wrotes no written code because the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:2) made him free. This life in Christ was the norm for ethical conduct. Both Paul and Matthew were dealing with definite situations. Both were related to Jew growing church and both wrote with the church needs in view. "Christianity is a not unmistakable opinion for this first Gospel... It impresses by its clear arrangement, its massive dignity, its liturgical movement, its book more fit for reading in church services."[1] This does not mean that Matthew wrote didactically rather than historically. Jacoby's statement about the synoptic writers is true. "Die selben zuverlässige Geschichte berichten, sie schreiben aus der Überlieferung und aus eigenem Wissen (Leben). Die eine nicht Tendenzschriftsteller. Die verschiedenen Ihre lebendige Anschauung mit der geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit; unwillkürlich wird jene durch modifiziert diese beeinflusst haben. aber von einer bewussten tendenziösen Geschichtsbeschreibung sind sie weit entfernt."[2] Paul and Matthew had the irrepressible conformity of Christian witness before them and it is inevitable that their ethical statements should deal with a practical situation.

There is little question that Paul is one with

---

1. Bacon, The Sayings of the New Testament, 45-6.
2. Vorbetrachtungen Zum, 402.

Jesus ethically in his emphasis on love as the basal principle, in his union of religion and morality, in his belief that defilement comes from within rather than by outer things, in his service and self sacrifice, in his common attitude toward God and man.[1] But the attitude of Matthew who gives Jesus' teaching is the point in view here. As Weiss points out "we are forced to distinguish between the ethics of the Evangelists and the ethics of their source."[2] In the handling of material like the Sermon on the Mount, it is evident that Matthew's aim is to present a complete and definitive statement of Jesus' relation to the Law. He is the fulfiller of prophecy and a new lawgiver who consummates the old law. Here may be seen a norm in Matthew's mind which is different from Paul. The relative attitudes of each has been discussed in a foregoing section. Here it is sufficient to show that for Paul the law as an ethical norm is valuable so far as its moral precepts are concerned. Paul is a sturdy champion of the fundamental Jewish virtues. He demands of his Gentile converts that they separate themselves from all that would defile. But the Law while good for the Jew who still kept its ceremonial precepts, was not essential. There was a freedom from the Law in Christ (Rom.6:14f, 7:1-6, Gal.3:25, 4:5). Matthew tries to hold to the Law (23:23, 5:18-19).

---

1. Cf.Scott, Jesus and Paul, in Camb. Bib. Essays, 369f.
2. (Art.) Ethics, D.C.G., I, 543.

Jesus evidently in his emphasis on love as the moral principle, in his union of religion and morality, in his belief that determinant comes from within rather than by outer forces, in his service and self sacrifice, in his common attitude towards God and man.[1] But the attitude of Matthew has given Jesus' teaching in the point in view here. As Weiss points out "We are forced to distinguish between the ethics of the Synoptists and Christics of their source."[2] In the handling of material like the Sermon on the Mount, it is evident that Matthew's aim is to present a complete and definitive statement of Jesus' relation to the law. He is the Pontifex of prophecy and a new lawgiver who consecrates the old law. Here may be seen a note in Matthew's mind which is different from that. The relative attitudes of each has been discussed in a foregoing section. Here it is sufficient to note that for that the law as an ethical norm is valuable so far as its moral principles are concerned. That is a study of emphasis of the fundamental Jewish virtues. He examples of his teaching converts that they separate themselves from all that would defile. But the law still good for the day and until kept its ceremonial precepts, was not essential. Jesus was a freedom from the law in Christ (Jno.8:36; Rom.6:14; Gal.4:26, 5:1). Matthew tries to hold to the law (23:23, 5:18-19).

---

1. Bennett, James and Ewald. In Comm. Hist. Jesus, 1877.
2. Weiss, Bibliog. T. N.T., I. 54.

This difference may be due to the fact that Matthew was probably not writing to Gentiles. But Matthew's fondness for law may be seen in the Sermon on the Mount which for him is the Christian's law; moreover the delivery of the Sermon on a mountain and the arrangement of Beatitudes, parallel the experiences of Moses and the Ten Commandments. There are a number of parallels of the Sermon on the Mount and Paul[1] but it is worthy of notice that the parallels are found mainly in the Beatitudes rather than in fulfillment of the Law. With Paul the concept is different. "So ist das Leben nicht die Kopie eines Modells und nicht die tote Erfüllung eines Gesetzes, sondern ein aus der Gottes -- und Christus -- Gemeinschaft heraus immer neu quellendes, originales, individuelles Erzeugnis des Geistes, eine freie Schöpfung religiöser Innerlichkeit, die ihr Gesetz aus sich selbst schöpft."[2]

Matthew (7:24) and Paul agree on taking Jesus' life and teaching as a norm of ethical conduct. (Rom.12, Eph.5:25, 29; Col.3:13) Where Paul can quote Jesus' words he does so in dealing with a definite problem. In other cases he uses his best judgment and trusts the Spirit. At this point he differs from Matthew, who writes of Jesus in the flesh and hence takes a historical view rather than a mystical one. Paul trusts the Christian to have his mind renewed so that he prove

---

1. Marriott, Sermon on the Mount, 214-216.
2. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, 443.

This difference may be due to the fact that Martinus was probably not writing to Gerlach. The Martinus's Commons for Law may be seen in the Sermon on the Mount which for him is the Christian's law; moreover the delivery of the Sermon on a mountain and the arrangement of Beatitudes parallel the experiences of Moses and the Ten Commandments. There are a number of parallels of the Sermon on the Mount and Tao[1] but it is worthy of notice that the parallels are found mainly in the Beatitudes rather than in fulfillment of the Law. With Tao the concept is different. So let the Lehrer plant die Tugie eines Kaiserin und Mutter die Tore Betrübt und eines Gedenkes, anderen ein Aus der Gottes -- und Christus -- Unmitgemeft Herzens Trost und Gnadenreiche, ermunterlich, ermutigliche Tugenden des Herzens, eine Frucht schöpfenden religiöser Innerlichkeit, die ihr Gewehr aus einem einzigen Gedanken.[2]

Martinus (Tao) and Tao agree on taking Christ's life and teaching as a norm of ethical conduct. (Mat. 11, Luke 6, Tao. Tao.) Where Tao can quote Jesus' words he does so in dealing with a definite problem. In other cases he uses his own judgment and trusts the Spirit. At this point he differs from Martinus, who writes of Gottes in the flesh and hence takes a rationalistic view rather than a mystical one. Tao trusts the Christian to have his mind renewed so that he proves

---

1. Barlotti, Sermon on the Mount; Lia-Gie.
2. Weise, Das Tugendsystem, 445.

the good, acceptable and perfect will of God (Rom.12:2). Another norm held up by Paul is shown when he exhorts the Ephesians (5:1) to be imitators of God. Again he sets himself up as an example, (I Thess.1:6; I Cor.11:1). Other times he suggests as standards what is pleasing to God (Col. 1:9-10; Phil.2:13, II Cor.5:9); what is fitting (Rom.1:28) or becoming (Col.3:18, Eph.5:4, Rom.13:13, I Cor.7:35, I Thess. 4:12) or advantageous or profitable (II Cor.12:19). There is one parallel here in Matthew where it is suggested that it is more profitable to sacrifice one member than to lose one's whole body (5:29), but there is no relation on this point.

Turning now to motives it is clear that Matthew and Paul are similar in eschatalogical warnings to induce right conduct. This topic is given detailed consideration in the next section and here it is enough to indicate that both issued grave warnings about the wrath of God which would fall upon those without the kingdom of God who had brought forth evil fruits instead of the harvest of righteousness. So also rewards will be given to those who do right. "The free gift of God is eternal life." (Rom.6:21) "These shall go away into eternal punishment but the righteous unto eternal life (Mt.25:46). Another motive Paul finds in the κοινωνία (II Cor. 13:13; Phil.2:1; II Cor.1:7; Phil.3:10; Rom.8:17; Philem.5; 17; I Cor.10:16-21; 1:9). As sons of God, believers belong to the same family or are members of the same partnership.[1]

---

1. Scott, Fellowship of the Spirit,181, "The Fellowship is indeed the supreme instrument for spiritualizing and ethicizing these relations."

the good, sanctifies and perfects will of God (Rom.12:2). Another term used by Paul is "born when he exhorts the Ephesians (5:1) to be imitators of God. Again he sets himself up as an example. (I Thess.1:6; I Cor.11:1). Other times he suggests an attitude that is pleasing to God (Col. 1:9-10; Phil.2:13, II Cor.5:9): what is fitting (Rom.1:28) or becoming (Col.3:18, Eph.5:4, Rom.13:13, I Cor.7:35, I Thess. 4:12) or advantageous or profitable (II Cor.12:1). There is one parallel here in matters where it is suggested that it is more profitable to sanctify one member than to lose one's whole body (6:19), but there is no relation on this point.

Turning now to motives it is clear that Christ and Paul are similar in eschatological warnings to induce right conduct. This topic is given detailed consideration in the next section and here it is enough to indicate that Paul usual grave warnings about the wrath of God which would fall upon those without the kingdom of God who had brought forth evil fruits instead of the harvest of righteousness. So also rewards will be given to those who do right. "The free gift of God is eternal life." (Rom.6:23). These words as many in- to eternal punishment but the righteous unto eternal life (Mt.25:46). Another motive Paul finds in the knowledge (II Cor. 13:13; Phil.2:1; II Cor.5:7; Phil.2:1; Rom.11:7; Galatians 3:5; I Cor.12:11-13 ASV). As sons of God, believers belong to the same family or are members of the same personality.[1]

---

1. Scott, Fellowship of the Spirit,163. "The fellowship is indeed the supreme instrument for spiritualizing and sanctifying these relations."

They are joint heirs with Christ. They are one person in Christ. Paul thus emphasizes the solidarity of man. He believes in the joint interest which binds humanity together, and makes a brother's interest truly one's own. All things may be lawful for him but he will not do all things for they are not expedient nor edifying. (I Cor.6:12; 10:23) And since there are members of the Church for whom Christ died he will not cause any of them to stumble (I Cor.8:11;13). These self-sacrificing purposes for the sake of other believers are all evident in Matthew's gospel. The Sermon on the Mount is directed to the disciples and Paul's instructions are for the circle of believers, but there is an implicit universalism in each. There is a parallelism in steadfastness or consistency. The wise builder in Matther has a sure and permanent foundation and Paul emphasizes the need of consistent living for the higher things (Col.3:1-8). Underlying all other principles is the command to serve one another through love.[1] As Jesus in Matthew, urges that all the law and prophets hang upon love for God and love for neighbor so Paul in his Corinthian letter (I Cor.12) sings the matchless hymn to love. His emphasis on love appears throughout his advices. (Gal.4:14; Rom. 13:8; Col.3:14; I Thess.4:9; Rom.8:28; I Cor.16:22; Phil.

---

1. Weiss, (Das Urchristentum, 443, note) states surprisingly that "Eine wirklich, umfassende, sprachgeschichtliche, religions-und sittengeschichtliche Erforschung des Wortes Agape und der darin enthaltenen Ideale fehlt uns noch, ist aber ein dringendes Bedürfnis."

They are joint heirs with Christ. They are one person in Christ. Paul thus emphasizes the unidentity of man. He believes in the joint interest which binds inseparably together, and makes a brother's interest truly one's own. All things may be lawful for him but he will not do all things for they are not expedient nor edifying. (I Cor.6:12; 10:23) and since there are members of the Church for whom Christ died he will not cause any of them to stumble (I Cor.8:11;12). These self-sacrificing purposes for the sake of other believers are all evident in Christian's people. The Sermon on the Mount is directed to the disciples and Paul's instructions are for the circle of believers, but there is an implicit universalism in each. There is a participism in strangeness or consistency. The wise builder in Christ has a sure and permanent foundation and Paul emphasizes the need of consistent living for the higher things (Col.3:1-4). Underlying all other principles is the command to serve one another through love.[1] As Jesus in Christ, urges that all the law and prophets hang upon love for God and love for neighbor so Paul in his Corinthian letter (I Cor.13) sings the matchless hymn to love. His emphasis on love appears throughout his epistles. (Gal.4:14; Rom. 12:10; Col.3:14; I Thess.4:9; Rom.8:28; I Cor.1:10; Phil.

---

1. Weiss, (Der Urchristentum, 41b, note) states surprisingly that "Ohne wirklich, ernstmeinende, unverlogenschlichtliche, reliviewsfreie, allgemeinmenschliche Betrachtung sei Jesus Ziele und der durch Christus Ziele fort und fort, ist Jesu ein Widerspruch Jesu."

1:9). Love is the center of his ethical thinking. He believes in being rooted and grounded in love. He writes much of this love as shown toward the brethren. The origin of love is divine as manifested in Jesus Christ (Eph.51:25; Gal.2:20, Eph.2:4; Rom.5:8). It is shed abroad in men's hearts and is the final and total moral obligation. "Love as the central and controlling motive of character and conduct became in fact, the differentia of the Christian."[1]

In the practical relations of everyday life Paul has detailed advices about masters and slaves, women in the church, parents and children, work and idol meats which are not brought up as ethical problems in Matthew. In Paul's advices about marriage (I Cor.7) there is a certain ascetism which is paralleled only in Matthew (19). Whether this attitude toward celibacy was increasing in the church at this early date or whether Matthew reflects a Pauline teaching it is difficult to say. Paul's advices are the only ones known to us and may have been used to spread celibate ideas. In the marriage relations he found the same lofty ideals as Jesus. Marriage is typical of the love of Christ for the Church. But he allows divorce or separation if the unbeliever

---

1. Scott, Fellowship of the Spirit, 105. Cf. Harnack, Miss. and Exp.of Christianity,I, 183. "The new language on the lips of Christians was the language of love. But it was more than a language, it was a thing of power and action. The Christians really considered themselves brothers and sisters and their actions corresponded to this belief."

Life. Love is the center of his ethical thinking. He believes in being rooted and grounded in love. He writes much of this love as always toward the brethren. The origin of love is divine as exhibited in Jesus Christ (Eph. 5:25; Gal. 2:20, Eph. 2:4; Rom. 5:8). It is cited abroad in man's hearts and is the final and total moral obligation. "Love as the central and controlling motive of character and conduct became in fact, the difference of the Christian."[1]

To the practical religious of everyday life Paul has definites advices about masters and slaves, women in the church, priests and children, work and idol meats which are not brought up as ethical problems in Matthew. In Paul's advices about marriage (1 Cor. 7) there is a certain mysticism which is paralleled only in Matthew (19). Whether this attitude toward celibacy was increasing in his church at this early date or whether Matthew reflects a tradition concerning it is difficult to say. Paul's advices are the only ones known to us and may have been used to spread ascetic ideas. In the marriage relations he found the same lofty ideals as Jesus. Marriage is typical of the love of Christ for the Church. Sex be allows divorce or separation if the unbeliever

---

1. Scott, Fellowship of the Spirit, 108. Cf. Harnack, Mission and Exp. of Christianity, I. 100. "The new language on the lips of Christians was the language of love. But it was more than a language, it was a thing of power and action. The Christians really constituted rivalry-relation brotherhood and showed new their actions corresponded to this belief."

departs (I Cor.7:15). In Matthew it is only for unchastity (5:32, 19:3-8). In regard to civil authorities both Paul (Rom.11:1-7) and Matthew (22:21; 17:25-27) agree in deferring to them as guardians of peace and order. No occasion for stumbling should be given even in paying taxes.

There is one divergence in conduct which appears in Paul and Matthew. The former reiterates the place of joy in daily life. "Rejoice in the Lord always, again I will say rejoice" (Phil.4:4). There is a certain pessimism in Matthew's outlook. It may well be due to his apocalyptic outlook, a view which Paul stresses less in his later letters, but there is a shadowing of the present, a certain doom, a wailing and gnashing of teeth (13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30) which is unlike Paul's cheerful insistence on the joy of life in Christ, and though in Matthew, this doom is for wrongdoers, it is a warning for the good as well.

In conclusion, Paul and Matthew are alike in the great ethical principles of the Christian life, which were largely derived from Jesus' teaching along with some Jewish ethics. The only notable likeness which is peculiar in each is a certain celibate attitude toward marriage. In this case there is a recognition of celibacy in each writer which may reflect an early church attitude but which in Matthew is difficult to reconcile with Jesus' other views on marriage. Consequently Matthew may be said to reflect an early church

exemption both in regard to divorce and celibacy, but the evidence is insufficient to prove Pauline dependence, though it is probable that Paul's ideas of celibacy were known in church circles. Paul's ethical teaching might be summed up in quadrilateral fashion (1) "Through love serve one another" forms the base. (2) Be consistent or steadfast in all conduct is one side and (3) the other, ~~is~~ separation from all defilement, while (4) Rejoice always in the Lord provides the top. This foursided program meant release from Jewish law, redemption from Gentile debasements and a life of increasing perfection in the Fellowship of believers. Matthew like Paul combines religion and morality but finds moral perfection in keeping not only with the Jewish law but much more its fuller spiritual manifestation in Jesus' precepts. In loving service even to the least, there is eternal life and in the somber shadow of the End all conduct must bring forth good fruits. Although each writer has eschatological elements in his thought yet "the theory of an interim-ethic may be confidently put aside"[1] as far as Jesus is concerned, while eschatology as it affects Paul and Matthew is the next subject for consideration.

---

1. Scott, Ethical Teaching of Jesus, 43.

complicated lots in regard to divorce and celibacy, but the evidence is insufficient to prove Taoistic acquaintance. Though it is probable that Tzu's ideas of celibacy were known in church circles. Tzu's ethical teaching might be summed up in quadrilateral fashion (1) "Through love serve one another" forms the base. (2) Be consistent or straight in all conduct is one side and (3) the other, is separation from all defilement, while (4) Religion always in the lead provides the top. This fourfold pledge means release from Karma law, redemption from textile ignorance and a life of increasing perfection in the relationship of brotherhood. Neither Tzu's doctrine religion and morality but finds moral perfection in keeping not only with the Tzu'ch law but much more its fuller spiritual manifestation in Tzu'ch' progeny. In loving service even in the lower, there is eternal life and in the higher sphere of the Tao all conduct must bring forth good fruits. Although each writer has eschatological elements in his thought yet "the theory of an after-death may be confidently put aside"[1] as far as Tzu is concerned, while eschatology as it affects Tzu and matches is the next subject for consideration.

---

1. Grant, Mystical Teaching of Tzu, 44.

11. ESCHATOLOGY.

The subject of eschatology is one of extraordinary complexity and its prominence in theological discussion has been greatly increased through the work of men like Baldensperger, J.Weiss, Schweitzer and Charles. In this subject Matthew has more parallels with Paul than any other of the gospel writers and this is notable when it is often claimed that they are moving in contrary directions in eschatology.[1] It is probably correct to hold that there is an ascending scale in the tendency to emphasize and conventionalize the apocalyptic teaching as represented in a progression from Q, through Mark and Matthew to Revelation. Paul's letters, on the other hand, may be maintained to represent a process of development, under the influence of great, formative Christian conceptions, away from prominent Jewish eschatological ideas to a position where most of these heterogenous elements are dropped.[2] In support of this contention, four stages may be discerned in his letters:

	Eschatological features
(1) I and II Thess.	1. Apostasy and anti-Christ. 2. Parousia and final judgment. 3. Resurrection and consummation of faithful.

---

1. Streeter, Oxford Stud.Syn.Problem, 425; Four Gospels, 521.
2. Charles, Eschat. 378f; Ency.Bib.II 1381f; McNeile (St.Paul, 20) believes that Paul practically gave up the expectation of an imminent catastrophe, but Morgan (Relig. and Theol. of Paul, 228) and Beckwith (Apoc. of John, 87,) hold that he never lost his belief in the nearness of the Parousia.

II. ECCLESIOLOGY.

The subject of ecclesiology is one of extraordinary complexity and its prominence in theological speculation has been greatly increased through the work of men like Heidegger, Jaspers, Schweitzer and Barth. In this subject Tillich has more parallels with Paul than any other of the gospel writers and this is notable when it is often claimed that they are moving in contrary directions in ecclesiology.[1] It is probably correct to hold that there is no accounting scale in the tendency to emphasize and conventionalize the apocalyptic teaching as represented in a progression from Q, through Mark and Matthew to Revelation. Paul's letters, on the other hand, may be delineated to represent a process of development, under the influence of great, formative Christian conceptions, away from premature Jewish eschatological ideas to a position where each of these heterogeneous elements are dropped.[2] In support of this contention, four stages may be discerned in his letters:

Eschatological Feature

(1) 1 and 2 Thess. 1. Apostasy and anti-Christ.
2. Parousia and final judgment.
3. Resurrection and consummation of faithful.

---

1. Stauffer, Oxford Stud. Syn. Problem, 223; Von Campenhausen, 201.
2. Charles, Apoc., 378; Weiss, Die 2 Briefe; Schmiedel (Ency. Bibl., 50) believes that Paul practically gave up the expectation of an imminent catastrophe, but Morgan (Jesus, Paul and Paul, 229) and Beckwith (Apoc. of John, 87) hold that he never lost his belief in the coming of the Parousia.

(2)	I. Cor.	1. Parousia and Judgment. 2. Resurrection. 3. Consummation of the blessed.
(3)	II Cor. & Rom.	1. Parousia and final judgment. 2. Universal spread of Christ's kingdom on earth. 3. Resurrection, an immediate sequel to this life.
(4)	Phil., Col., Eph.	1. Everlasting duration of Christ's kingdom. 2. Extension of Christ's redemption to spiritual beings.[1]

In view of the fact that Paul and Matthew are moving in opposite directions concerning eschatology yet have much in common,[2] the problem arises regarding their mutual reference or dependence on earlier writings. Since the subject is difficult it seems best to consider it under various sub-headings as follows: (1) the Age - present and future. (2) Signs of the end. (3) The Parousia. (4) The Resurrection. (5) The Judgment. (6) The final kingdom or consummation.

For Paul, as for his Jewish and Christian contemporaries, the whole order of things is divided into two great epochs,[3] (1) ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος , co-extensive with the present world and as far as it is not subordinated to God it is evil (Rom.12:2; I Cor.1:20; 2:6,8; 3:18; II Cor.4:4; Gal.1:4. In

---

1. Cf.Charles, Ency.Bib.II, 1381f; Thackeray, (Relation of St.Paul to Contemp.Jew.Thought 98f.) finds only three stages: I Thess.; I Cor.15; and II Cor. and Phil.
2. Cf.Shaw, Pauline Epistles, 225-6.
3. Matthews, Mess. Hope in N.T. 163. "The entire Pauline scheme is conditioned upon the belief in two ages." Cf.Dodd, Meaning of Paul for Today, 40, note.

I Cor.10:11 the plural (οἱ αἰῶνες) suggests that the epoch could be thought to have divisions). (2) ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων , the coming age when God's rule shall be attained (Eph.1:21; of 2:7; Rom.8:8; I Cor.3:19; 5:10). Since Paul's references to the future age are few, it may be seen that the concept is more often occupied by the kingdom of God (I Thess.2:12; II Thess.1:5; I Cor.15:24; Gal.5:21).[1] This distinction between the present and future age appears frequently in Paul's thought, e.g. "The time that now is" (Rom.8:18), "this world" (I Cor.3:19; 5:10; 7:31; Eph.2:2). For Paul the present epoch is drawing to a close and in the new era which will soon come, God's rule will be established (I Cor.7:29; 10:11; 15:51; 16:22; Rom.13:11; I Thess.4:15; Phil.4:5). This immediate expectation may have faded somewhat later in Paul because there is no mention of it in Colossians or Ephesians.[2]

The similarities of these beliefs in Matthew are noticeable, e.g. "The cares of this age." (13:22) Sin against the Holy Spirit is unforgiveable either in this age or in the age to come (12:32). The present generation is evil (4:8,9; 12:39) and stands in direct contrast to the good age to come, which shall be under God's direct rule.[3] There is to be an end (24:13) and endurance until that time means salvation. Matthew strongly stresses the end of the age, "the completion

---

1. Cf. Dalman, Words of Jesus, 148.
2. McNeile, St. Paul, 271.
3. Cf. Pfleiderer, Prim. Christianity, I, 71; Jackson, Eschatology of the Gospels, 40.

of the transitory course of the world."[1] He is the only Evangelist to use the technical expression "the end of the age" (13:39,40,49; 24:3; 28:20). The writer of Hebrews is the only other New Testament author to use the expression and there (9:26) it is "to the end of the ages". Matthew's use is very close to Paul's in τὸ τέλος (24:6,14; 10:22; 24:13) (I Cor.10:11 τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων). On this point it is probable that both are drawing their vocabulary from a common source of Jewish Christian eschatological language but their agreement in ideas is marked also.

Both Paul and Matthew are distinguished by special passages devoted to eschatology, in which their ideas can be traced with considerable fullness. Paul's longest references are in the Thessalonian letters (I, 4:13-18; 5:1-11; II, 2: 1-12) and Matthew's apocalypse appears in Chap.24, although he has many scattered references also. In these sections, both Matthew and Paul follow the customary Jewish plans for apocalyptic writing, viz. signs foreshadowing the end, the coming of the Messiah, resurrection from the dead, last judgment and inauguration of the kingdom.[2] The dividing line between the two ages is the coming of the Lord. His coming is preceded by notable signs. In Paul's thinking there was to be a great apostasy (II Thess.2:3-10) and the revelation

---

1. McNeile, St. Matt., 201; Dalman, op.cit., 155.
2. Charles, H.B.D., I, 741-749.

of the "man of sin". The apostasy is variously taken to be of Christians[1] or of non-Christians,[2] or of Jews.[3] The man of sin or lawlessness has had many identifications,[4] personal and impersonal. It is notable that Paul uses the veiled and vague language of apocalyptic. He does not connect his eschatology with the destruction of Jerusalem for the man of sin is to sit in the temple (II Thess.2:4). His opposition to God has led to the belief that here in Paul is the beginning of an anti-Christ teaching. "Anti-Christ was born under Caligula in 40 A.D."[5] The main point in Paul is that before the coming of the Lord there is to be some lawless one who will set himself up as God. His evil influence is already at work in the world, but he will be destroyed. In the first Thessalonian letter (5:1-6) there are no signs given for the coming. It will come as a thief in the night. This is not contradictory to the second letter but rather complementary. In the first letter Paul had not given more than the main point of the coming; in the second he met the need of more detailed information in order to prevent abuses.[6]

In Matthew (24:3) the disciples come to Jesus and ask

---

1. Beckwith, op.cit., 88.
2. Frame, Thess. 250; Holtzman, Theol. II, 192.
3. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of Last Things, 218.
4. Frame, 254; Charles, Rev.II, 77; Bacon, Gospel of Mk.,88-98, gives good historical background; Kennedy, op.cit. 218.
5. Bacon, op.cit. 94; cf. Frame, 253-254.
6. Jülicher, Intro., 66.

of the "man of sin". The apostasy is variously taken to be of Christians[1] or of non-Christians,[2] or of Jews.[3] The man of sin or lawlessness has had many identifications, personal and impersonal. It is notable that Paul uses the veiled and vague language of apocalyptic. He does not connect his eschatology with the destruction of Jerusalem for the man of sin is to sit in the temple (II Thess. 2:4). His opposition to God has led to the belief that here in Paul is the beginning of an anti-Christ tradition. "Anti-Christ" was born under Caligula in 40 A.D.[4] The main point in Paul is that before the coming of the Lord there is to be some lawless one who will get himself up as God. His evil influence is already at work in the world, but he will be destroyed. In the first Thessalonian letter (5:1-8) there are no signs given for the coming. It will come as a thief in the night. This is not contradictory to the second letter but rather complementary. In the first letter Paul had not given more than the main points of the coming; in the second he met the need of more detailed information in order to prevent abuses.[5]

In Matthew (24:3) the disciples come to Jesus and ask

---

1. Teeselink, op. cit., 32.
2. Frame, Thess. 250; Robertson, Paul, 71, 102.
3. Lamsway, St. Paul's Conception of Last Things, 218.
4. Cheyne, Jew. Quarter. Rev. 11, 77; Bacon, Gospel of Mk., 88-90, Gives good historical background; Connolly, op. cit. 216.
5. Bacon, op. cit. 90; cf. Frame, 255-256.
6. Williams, Intro., 60.

"When shall these things (temple destruction) be and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world." The last two requests are peculiar to Matthew. The signs will be false Christs, great national disturbances and cosmic upheavals. Then there will be persecutions "for my name's sake", false prophets, lawlessness multiplied and the love of many shall wax cold (apostasy), the gospel shall be preached to all nations, then shall the end come. (24:4-14) The end will be ushered in by a period of unprecedented distress. An abomination of desolation will appear in the holy place. There will be terrible sufferings and false Christs will again arise (24:15-28). Matthew's agreements with Paul about apostasy, lawlessness, the coming as a thief in the night, the necessity for watchfulness, and the false leadership are evident but there are some minor but significant changes. Matthew connects the destruction of Jerusalem and the signs of the Coming. He looks back on this devastation of the city (22:7) and in it reads a warning of an imminent end. "He was perfectly familiar with Daniel's apocalypse and accepted it as infallible authority."[1] Paul's evident choice not to use Daniel is significant. "It is surely not simply an accident that Paul makes so little use of the more distinctively apocalyptical parts of the Old Testament".[2] Whereas Paul tends to correct the Thessalonians by warnings about mistaking the

---

1. Bacon, op. cit., 64.
2. Porter, J.B.L., XLI, (1922) 188.

Then shall there come signs (Greek heteroi sēmeia) be and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world." The last two requests are peculiar to Matthew. The signs will be false Christs, great national disturbances and cosmic upheavals. Then there will be persecutions for my name's sake, false prophets, lawlessness multiplied and the love of many shall waxe cold (apostasy). The gospel shall be preached to all nations. Then shall the end come. (24:1-14) The end will be ushered in by a period of unprecedented distress, an abomination of desolation will appear in the holy place. There will be terrible sufferings and false Christs will again arise (24:15-28). Matthew's preoccupation with Jesus' apostasy, lawlessness, the coming as a thief in the night, the necessity for watchfulness, and the false leadership are evident but there are some minor but significant changes. Matthew connects the destruction of Jerusalem and the signs of the Coming. He looks back on this desolation of the city (22:7) and in it reads a warning of an judgment and. "He was perfectly familiar with Daniel's apocalypse and accepted it as infallible authority."[1] Daniel's evident choice not to use Daniel is significant. "It is surely not simply an accident that Paul makes so little use of the more distinctively apocalyptical parts of the Old Testament."[2] Whereas Paul tends to correct the Thessalonians by warnings about relaxing the

---

1. Moore, op. cit.
2. Torrey, E.E., Art. (1928) 1ab.

Coming, Matthew accentuates apocalyptic hopes,[1] by making more definite and positive predictions about the Parousia (7:21-23; 13:40-43; 47-50; 22:11-13; 25:31-46). Before the disciples could have gone over the cities of Israel the Son of Man is promised to come (10:23). When Mark vaguely indicates (9:1) that death will not come to some until they see the kingdom of God come with power, Matthew writes "till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom" (16:28). He adds to the Markan record the word "immediately" which shows expectancy after the fall of Jerusalem (24:29). Yet with this apocalyptic encouragement in Matthew there are evidences that he expected some delay (25:19; 24-48) e.g. until the gospel is preached to every nation. This is reminiscent of Pauline universalism. "Matthew would repress premature enthusiasm with ultimate encouragement."[2] In due season all the apocalyptic hopes will be fulfilled. He differs from Paul in not having a man of lawlessness. Instead, he follows Daniel in naming an abomination in a holy place. This indefinite location in Matthew is probably due to the knowledge that the temple had been destroyed. The idea of profanation is present in both but the profaning person or object differs. These agreements and slight disagreements about the signs of the coming may be due to the use of "A Little Apocalypse" which

---

1. Dewick, Prim. Christian Eschat., 177-178.
2. Bacon, op. cit., 103.

Conley, Bacon's secretary apocalyptic hopes,[1] by making more definite and positive predictions about the Jacobean (7:5)-(8:1; 12:40-42; 47-50; 22:11-13; 22:21-42). Before the Aristotle could have gone over the claims of Israel the Son of Man is promised to come (19:28). Then Mark vaguely insinuates (9:1) that death will not come to some until they see the kingdom of God come with power, Matthew writes "till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom" (16:28). He adds to the Markan record the word "immediately" which shows expectancy after the fall of Jerusalem (24:29). Yet even this apocalyptic concentrement in Matthew there are evidences that is expected some delay (25:19; 24-26) e.g. until the Gospel is preached to every nation. This is reminiscent of Pauline universalism. "Matthew would express premature enthusiasm with ultimate consummation."[2] In due season all the apocalyptic hopes will be fulfilled. He differs from Paul in not having a sense of imminence. Instead, he follows Daniel in marking an elongation in a long phase. This uncertain location in Matthew is probably due to the knowledge that the temple had been destroyed. The idea of proclamation is present in both but the preaching differs or subject differs. There appears and slight disagreeable about the signs of the coming may be due to the use of "A little Apocalypse" which

---

1. Davies, Pirm. Christian Ethics, 199-120.
2. Bacon, op. cit., 103.

was written by Jewish Christians and based upon general warnings by Jesus, combined with utterances of Christian prophets and Old Testament apocalyptic. This theory first developed by Colani[1] and taken up by many later defenders and attackers[2] is not the main concern here. The probabilities point to common material known and used by Matthew and Paul, with Matthew showing an advanced knowledge of apocalyptic terms but with a tendency away from Paul's position. Matthew emphasizes eschatological ideas in striking fashion but Paul, while using them does not find his main interest there. This judgment is at variance with a view which holds that Paul's outlook is at bottom that of Jewish apocalyptic.[3] Paul's outlook here is determined by different factors, viz. his Jewish training, his persecutions, his direct revelations and his new nature as created by contact with Christ.[4] His dominant interest seems to be ethical, religious and prophetic. He would have the Thessalonians live rightly, here and now, before the signs of the end. The proportion of eschatology in his letters and in his Old Testament citations does not indicate

---

1. Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques (205, 214-215).
2. For list of authors and discussions see Moffatt, Intro., 209; McNeile, St.Mt., 343; Charles, Eschat., 328; Dewick, Prim.Christian Eschat., 176; Dobschutz, Eschat.of the Gospels, 55-58.
3. Morgan, Relig. & Theol. of Paul, 6; Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, throughout.
4. Cf. Thackeray, op.cit., 101; Porter, op.cit., 195; Sanday, Hib.Jour., X, 103.

was written by Jewish Christians and based upon general acceptance by Jews, combined with utterances of Christian prophets and Old Testament apocalyptic. While Theory first developed by Talmi[1] and taken up by many later defenders who attack[2] is not the main concern here. The probabilities point to common material known and used by Matthew and Paul, with Matthew bringing an advanced knowledge of apocalyptic terms but with a tendency away from Paul's preaching. Matthew emphasizes eschatological ideas in stirring feeling but Paul, while using them does not find his main interest there. This judgment is at variance with a view so dominant that Paul's outlook is at bottom that of Jewish apocalyptic.[3] Paul's outlook here is determined by different factors, viz. his Jewish training, his experiences, his direct revelations and his mission as created by contact with Christ.[4] His dominant interest seems to be ethical, religious and prophetic. He would have the Thessalonians live rightly, here and now, before the signs of the end. The proportion of eschatology in his letters and in his Old Testament citations are not indicate

---

1. Edouard Dujardin et les Origines Wagnériennes (Paris, 1931-1932).
2. For list of authors and discussions see Martin, Op. cit., Intro. xxiv-xxvi.
3. Bousset, Op. cit., Jesus, Weber, Op. cit., Jewish Theologie, Schlatter, Jesus, Bernhart, Lehrer der Christenheit, Schmiedel, Op. cit.
4. Morgan, Relig. & Theol. of Paul, 5; Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, Introduction.
5. Dr. Thackeray, op. cit., 120; Taylor, op. cit., 146; Sanday, Rom. Lect., 2, 120.

more than a knowledge and use of it. There is no subservience to it. On the other hand Matthew, who although he uses his apocalyptic for moral purposes[1] as shown by his picture of the Last Judgment, his call for repentance and doing the Lord's will, reflects an intense apocalyptic expectation which surpasses Paul. The Thessalonians were the only Pauline church seriously disturbed by apocalyptic ideas. This fact has significance for the relative place such ideas must have held in Paul's teaching.

The Parousia in Pauline and Matthean thinking has interesting parallels. Matthew alone of the Synoptics uses Parousia (24:3;27;37;39). Paul has it frequently (I Thess. 3:13, 23; I Cor.15:23). Both authors present the idea often, though not using the word (Parousia) e.g. "To await his Son from heaven" (I Thess.1:10); "The Lord himself shall descend" (I Thess.4:16); "The revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven." (II Thess.1:7); "We expect a Savior" (Phil.3:20); "When he comes to be glorified" (II Thess.1:10); "When Christ is manifested." (Col.3:4). Aside from the references in the apocalyptic chapter (24) Matthew shows Jesus as referring to the coming of the Son of Man to reward his followers (16:24-28). He foretells a similar coming at his farewell to Jerusalem (23:37-29). He interprets the parable of the tares and refers to the Son of Man as sending his angels to gather the

---

1. Cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, 552.

tares (13:40-41). Before the high priest (26:64) and again in the picture of the Son of Man at the Judgment, the coming is foretold. Both Matthew and Paul agree on the suddenness and the necessity of watchfulness and faithfulness. (Mt.24: 42; 45-61; 25:14-30) (I Cor.15:51; I Thess.4:15; 17; 5:2,3) In both there are similar manifestations, the Parousia will be visible, with angels, in the sky; each writer mentions a trumpet. (Mt. only of the Synoptists), and the chosen ones are to be caught up in the air from the four corners of the earth (Mt.25:29-31; I Thess.5:2), but both evince hope that it will come in their own time (I Thess.4:15; Mt.24:34). This is mixed with other expectations. God "will raise us up through his power". (I Cor.6:14; Mt.28:20).[1] Neither author has the expression "Second coming". For each it is the Coming. Christ had suffered and died but was coming in the clouds in glory.[2] "Paul knows three comings of Christ."[3] First is the historical coming. The cross is a dividing point and with the resurrection the age to come had already begun. Second, the coming of Christ as Spirit. "In Christ" illustrates this idea. Third, the still future coming which means not national nor political dominance but "the completion of the coming of Divine Love and that in its only conceivable embodiment in personalities." It needs to be added that Paul

---

1. Cf.Beblavý, Les Idées Eschatologiques, 31; McNeile, N.T. Tchg. in the Light of St. Paul's, 19-20.
2. DuPont, Le Fils de l'Homme, 121.
3. Porter, op.cit., 197f.

tarse (Jo:4b-4a). Before the high priest (Ge:4b) and again in the picture of the Son of man at the Judgment, the coming is foretold. Both Martinez and Saint-Agrve on the gnostamness and the necessity of watchfulness and faithfulness. (Mt.24; 25; 4b-6b; Ro:1a-3b) (I Cor.1a:8b; I Thess.4:15; 17; 5:1,2) In both, there are similar manifestations, the heavens will be visible, with angels. In the sky; Saint writer mentions a trumpet. (Mt. only of the Synoptists), and the unborn ones are to be caught up in the air from the four corners of the earth (Mt.24:29-31; I Thess.5:2). But both orthrs hope that it will come in their own time (I Thess.4:15; Mt.24:34). This is mixed with other expectations. God "will raise us up through His power". (I Cor.6:14; Mt.24:30).[1] Matthew mentions the expression "second coming". For each it is the Coming. Christ had suffered and died but was coming in the clouds in glory.[2] Paul knows three comings of Christ.[3] First is the historical coming. The cross is a dividing point and with the resurrection the age to come had already begun. Second, the coming of Christ as Spirit. In Christ illustrates this idea. Third, the still future coming which means not national nor political dominance but "the consummation of the coming of divine love and that in its only conceivable embodiment in personalities." It needs to be added that Paul

---

1. Cf. Bultmann, Das Urchristentum im Zeitalter des Religionen. 2. Cf. Bultmann, Jesus. In the light of St. Paul's. 19-20.
3. Martin, Le Vrie de l'Homme. 121.
3. Porter, op.cit., 1207.

held not only Jewish apocalyptic hopes which he Christianized but also a spiritual view of Christ which at times seems formally opposed to any external manifestation or Parousia. But he held both ideas without conscious contradiction as often appears in great thinkers. Paul has only one reference to "the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God." (II Thess.1:8) The reference to fire is introduced with the idea of judgment and is similar to Matthew's fondness for fire (8:12; 13:42; 22:13; 25:30,41; 24:51), but Matthew does not give the flaming fire as an accompaniment of the Lord's appearing. Matthew reserves the fire for the wicked. These many parallels concerning the Parousia indicate that either Matthew and Paul had a common Jewish Christian tradition or else Matthew was familiar with the Pauline descriptions.[1] The number of similarities tends to make the latter alternative more probable, although certainty cannot be maintained because both writers may simply be familiar with a common source.

The Resurrection receives more elaborate treatment by Paul than any other conception in his Eschatology.[2] "La résurrection chez Saint Paul a une importance incomparable. C'est le centre de sa foi et la base de son esperance. Sans

---

1. Scott, (Pauline Epist., 225-226) lists the striking parallels of I and II Thess. and Mt. and believes that these writings were both written by Silas and Timothy.
2. Kennedy, op.cit., 222.

le résurrection il ne peut s'imaginer sa religion, sans elle toute la foi est vaine, (I Cor.15:14-17) sans elle il ne voit pas la raison pour laquelle il devrait travailler et endurer des souffrances à cause de l'évangile. Cette foi ferme a la résurrection donne la direction à toute sa vie, sans elle il ne comprend pas pourquoi on doit vivre moralement, il serait mieux de s'adonner à la débauche comme quelques païens qui disent 'mangeous et buvons, car demain nois mourrons' (I Cor. 15:32). Dans sa prédication comme aussi dans ses épîtres il revient sans cesse à la résurrection."[1] (I Thess.1:10; 4:14; Gal.1:1; I Cor.6:14-15; II Cor.4:14; Rom.4:25; 6:5;9;10; 8: 11; Eph.2:6; Phil.3:11; Col.2:12).

The time of the resurrection is at the Parousia (I Cor. 15:51-52; II Thess.4:17). The participants will be all believers whether living or dead. They are to be changed in the twinkling of an eye and will put on the spiritual nature of immortality; they will be conformed to the body of Christ's glory (Phil.3:21). Whether unbelievers will share in a resurrection cannot be determined from Paul's writings. He nowhere speaks of a general resurrection of all mankind. He definitely writes of a resurrection of believers. (I Thess. 4:16; I Cor.15:23) as if it were a distinct event. He argues for Christian resurrection from Christ's resurrection and applies his argument to Christians alone.[2] But he does expect

---

1. Beblavý, Idées Eschat. de St. Paul, 49.
2. Cf. Stevens, Pauline Theol. 354; Beckwith, op.cit., 93.

La résurrection il ne peut s'imaginer en religion, sans elle toute la foi est vaine, (I Cor.15:14-17) sans elle il ne voit pas la raison pour laquelle il devrait travailler et endurer des souffrances à cause de l'évangile. Cette foi forme à la résurrection donne la direction à toute sa vie, sans elle il ne désespérera pas pourquoi on doit vivre moralement. Il perdrait mieux de s'abonner à la sécurité sous quelque maître qui disent 'manges et buvons, car demain nous mourrons' (I Cor. 15:32). Dans ce présentation cette auteur donc ces épîtres il revient sans cesse à la résurrection.[1] (I Thess.1:10; 4:14; Col.1:1; I Cor.6:14-15; II Cor.4:14; Rom.4:24; 6:3;10;8:11; Eph.2:6; Phil.3:11; Col.2:12).

The time of the resurrection is at the Parousia (I Cor. 15:51-52; II Thess.4:17). The participants will be all believers whether living or dead. They are to be changed in the twinkling of an eye and will put on the spiritual nature of immortality; they will be conformed to the body of Christ's glory (Phil.3:21). Whether unbelievers will share in a resurrection cannot be determined from Paul's writings. He nowhere speaks of a general resurrection of all mankind. He definitely writes of a resurrection of believers. (I Thess. 4:16; I Cor.15:23) as if it were a distinct event. He argues for Christian resurrection from Christ's resurrection and applies his argument to Christians alone.[2] But he does expect

---

1. Holmes. Paths Taken. De Ex. Theol. 15.
2. Ed. Stevens. Christ Jesus Lord. 324; Somerville, op.cit., 62.

all men to be judged (I Cor.6:2; 11:32) and that seems to imply a resurrection. However there is no clear affirmation of the resurrection for unbelievers. The nature of the resurrected life is spiritual. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom (I Cor.15:50). The physical body must be sown in death, like seed in a harvest but God's power will provide a spiritual or glorified body.[1] That there is variance here between Paul's thought of resurrection at death and at the Parousia, seems apparent but he nowhere is conscious of it. His expectation of a speedy Parousia probably obviated the difficulty and he assures the Thessalonians (I Thess.4:13) that the dead are in Christ (cf.I Cor. 15:18) and that they too will share in the final hope of the Parousia with Christ.[2]

The place where the dead are located Paul does not attempt to describe. Probably "he shares the current Jewish belief"[3] in a place of the dead, Hades or Sheol. (Eph.4:9-10). As believers the dead are sharing God's presence (II Cor.5:8; Phil.1:23). The possibility of an intermediate state between death and the Parousia does not concern Paul and hence there is no developed teaching about it.[4] "The Christian world has never been able to agree, whether according to the New Testament there is or is not an intermediate state."[5] It is hardly

---

1. Cf. Charles, Eschat., 392.
2. Cf. Frame, op.cit., 166; Kennedy, op.cit., 267f.
3. Morgan, Relig. & Theol. of Paul, 232.
4. Ibid, 232.
5. Stevens, A.J.T., VI, 4, 680.

all men to be judged (1 Cor.4:5; 11:32) and that seems to imply a resurrection. However there is no clear affirmation of the resurrection for unbelievers. The nature of the resurrected life is spiritual. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom (1 Cor.15:50). The physical body must be sown in death, like seed in a harvest but God's power will provide a spiritual or glorified body.[1] That there is variance here between Paul's thought of resurrection at death and at the Parousia, seems apparent but he makes no conclusive of it. His expectation of a speedy Parousia probably obviated the difficulty and he assumes the identification (1 Thess.4:13) that the dead are in Christ (cf.1 Cor. 15:18) and that they too will share in the final hope of the Parousia with Christ.[2]

The place where the dead are located Paul does not attempt to describe. Probably he shares the current Jewish belief[3] in a place of the dead, Hades or Sheol. (Rom.4:9-10). He believes the dead are sharing God's presence (II Cor.5:8; Phil.1:23). The possibility of an intermediate state between death and the Parousia does not concern Paul and hence there is no developed teaching about it.[4] The Christian world has never been able to agree, whether according to the New Testament there is or is not an intermediate state.[5] It is hardly

---

1. Cf. Charles, Zaehner, op.
2. Jr. Frame, op.cit., ICC; Kennedy, op.cit., EGT.
3. Morgan, Philip. A Theol. of Paul, 1909.
4. Ibid, 1920.
5. Stevens, A.J.T., 7:4, 1920.

correct however to hold that he changed his ideas (I Cor. 15; II Cor.5:1-10) from an imminent resurrection at the Parousia to a belief that the Parousia was superfluous because the soul departed at once to the Lord.[1] When Paul writes "We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" he "does not at all mean to set aside the enthusiastic expectation of Christ's immediate advent. His own doubt is this: will he himself be still alive? The event is not postponed; on the contrary, it draws nigh rapidly as he writes to the Romans "now is our salvation nearer than when we believed" (13:11,12). "We look for the salvation from heaven" (Phil.3:20).[2] The essential point in Paul is that "our citizenship is in heaven; from whence we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able to subject all things unto himself" (Phil.3:20-21). "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Rom.14:8). This is the main thought in Pauline eschatology. He is assured, above all, that it was God who raised Jesus from the dead and will raise us also with him (I Thess.1:10; Gal.1:1; Rom.4:17;24; 7:49; 6:4;

---

1. Cf. Kennedy op.cit., 262-3; Stevens, Pauline Theol.,358-9.
2. Dobschütz, Eschat. of Gospels, 9.

correct however to hold that he changed his idea (I Cor. 15: 37 cor.5:1-10) from an imminent resurrection at the Parousia to a belief that the Parousia was superfluous because the soul departed at once to the Lord.[1] When Paul writes "We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" he "does not at all mean to set aside the enthusiastic expectation of Christ's imminent advent. His own state is later will be blessed he still believes. The event is postponed; on the contrary, it seems high rapidly as he writes to the Thessa. "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed" (Ro.13:11,12). "We look for the salvation from heaven" (Phil.3:20).[2] The essential point in Paul is that "our citizenship is in heaven; from whence we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able to subject all things unto himself" (Phil.3:20-21). "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Rom.14:8). This is the main thought in Pauline eschatology. He is assured, Christ is risen and the raised Jesus from the dead and will raise us also with him (I Thess.4:10; Gal.1:1; Ro.4:17,24; 7:4; 8:1;

---

1. Cf. Kennedy op.cit., 222-3; Stevens, Pauline Theol., 264-5.
2. Deissmann, Studies of Inscrip., 2.

8:11; 10:7; I Cor.6:14; 15:15; II Cor.1:9; 4:14; Col.2:12, 20; 1:18; 3:3). This resurrection is made sure through oneness with Christ in Spirit. In spiritual nature believers have already been raised with Christ (Col.3:1) and yet paradoxically Paul would be conformed unto Christ's death that he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. (Phil.3:10-11) Therefore Paul's great hope for the future rests upon his present experience of the spirit of Christ.[1] (Gal.2:20; II Cor.3:17-18; Rom.6:2-11; 8:9-11) "All things are yours.....the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come - and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I Cor.3:21-23). "No man can read the Pauline forecast of the future, as we find it in his letters to the Corinthians, without sharing in the enthusiasm with which he looks forward to the great change which is to come to all men."[2]

Little is said about the resurrection in Matthew when comparison is made with Paul. The apocalyptic features are the same as Paul. The elect shall be gathered at the Parousia (24:31). The resurrection is taken for granted by Matthew in his record of Jesus' dealing with the problem. Like Paul the final judgment (25:31f) presupposes a general resurrection (cf.11:22-24)[3] and like Paul, Matthew is non-committal about the question of a universal resurrection. When the

---

1. Porter, Paul's Belief in Life after Death, (Essay - Religion and the Future Life, 255.)
2. Mathews, Mess. Hope in N.T., 200.
3. Cf. Feine, Theol. des N.T., 113, 156.

(1:4); 10(?): I Cor. 6:14; 15 Cor.1:7; 6:14; Col. 1:22, Col. 1:20; 2:10. This resurrection is made sure through unions with Christ in Spirit. In spiritual matters matters are more closely been united with Christ (Col.2:1) and yet paradoxically that would be conditioned unto Christ's coming that he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. (Phil.3:10-12) Therefore Paul's great hope for the future rests upon his present experience of the spirit of Christ. (Gal.5:22; II Cor.3:17-18; Rom.8:2-11; 8:9-12) "All things are yours.....the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come - and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I Cor.3:21-23). The man can read the Muslim Forecast of the future, as we find it in his letters to the Corinthians, without sharing in the enthusiasm with which he looks forward to the great change which is to come to all men.[1]

Little is said about the resurrection in Zoroastrian eschatology is made with Paul. The eschatologic features are the same as Paul. The plant shall be quickened in the Zoroastrian (24:12). The resurrection is taken for granted by Mathias in his record of Jesus' teaching with the problem. Like Paul the final judgment (22:12) presupposes a general resurrection (22:11;20-22)[2] and like Paul, Mathias is non-committal about the question of a universal resurrection. When the

---

1. Porter, Paul's Belief in life after Death, (Essay - Religion and the Future Life, 20?
2. Mathews, Jesus in N.T., 207
3. Pf. Zeine, Theol. des N.T., 113, 126.

question of resurrection was presented to Jesus by the Sadducees, he is shown as proving that "as touching the resurrection of dead", there is no question for those who know the Scripture and the power of God (22:31). Luke in this account (20:35) seems to limit the resurrection to the just but there is no such evidence in Matthew. The form of the resurrection is beyond present human knowledge. They are as angels in heaven. "Those who rise from the dead belong to a higher world; this world, man, with all his penetration and learning, does not understand."[1] Nothing is said about a fleshly resurrection, though the advice about entering into life maimed has been held to indicate a resurrection body,(5:29) and to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob (8:11) may be either imagery or realistic,[2] though the idea of blessedness or happiness is the main point in Jesus' illustration. While there is scantiness of material in Matthew which refers directly to the resurrection there are cognate ideas which carry the same line of thought. "Eternal life", "treasure in heaven" (19:16f.), "your reward in heaven" (5:12; 10:42). Both Paul and Matthew view the resurrection from a period after Christ's resurrection and their thinking is more conditioned by that fact than any other.

The Judgment in Paul's thought occurs at the Parousia.[3]

---

1. Holtzman, Life of Jesus, 435.
2. Cf. Jackson, Eschat. of Jesus, 53; Dobschütz, Eschat. of Gospels, 119; Wendt, Tchg. of Jesus, I, 223.
3. Cf. McNeile, N.T. Tchg. in Light of St. Paul's, 195f.

question of resurrection was presented to Jesus by the Sadducees, he is shown as proving that "as touching the resurrection of dead", there is no question for those who know the Scriptures and the power of God (22:31). Here in this account (22:32) seems to limit the resurrection to the just but there is no such evidence in Matthew. The fact of the resurrection is beyond present human knowledge. They are as angels in heaven. "Those who rise from the dead belong to a higher world; this world, now, with its procreation and learning, does not understand."[1] Jesus is said to be a friendly resurrection, though the advice about entering into life maimed has been held to indicate a resurrection body,(9:43) and to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob (8:11) may be either imagery or realistic, though the idea of bleasedness or happiness is the main point in Jesus' illustration. While there is considerable of material in Matthew which refers directly to the resurrection there are separate ideas which carry the same line of thought. "Eternal life", "treasure in heaven" (19:16ff), "your reward in heaven" (5:12; 10:42). Both Paul and Matthew view the resurrection from a period after Christ's resurrection and their thinking is more conditioned by that fact than any other.

The judgment in Paul's thought occurs at the Parousia,

---

1. Bultmann, Life of Jesus, 42.
2. Cf. Jackson, Author. of Jesus, 67; Goodenough, Teacher of Mankind, 114; Manor, Tome. of Jesus, 1. 224.
3. Cf. Moffatt, ... Jesus, in Light of Jud's, 1924.

He prays that the Thessalonians may prove to be blameless (I Thess.3:13; 5:23). It will mean destruction for the wicked (I Thess.5:2; II Thess.1:6-10; 2:8). "The day of wrath" is an eschatological term (Rom.5:9; 12:19; I Thess. 1:10; 2:16). It is connected with "the revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom.2:5) upon evil doers. Every man will receive judgment according to his works (Rom.2:6; Eph.6:8; Col.3:24). "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the hearts" (I Cor.4:5). Fire is a symbol of the searching tests of a man's work (I Cor.3:12-15). The judgment in one place is attributed to God. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God." "Each shall give an account of himself to God" (Rom.14:10,12; cf.Rom.2:16). But Christ is also the Judge. "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each may receive the things done in the body according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (II Cor.5:10). Here the thought is of a public tribunal. But he also thinks of a private or spiritual judgment which is going on in men's lives which is ethical rather than eschatological. God tests men's hearts (I Thess.2:4). If a man chooses sin he is handed over to it (Rom.1:24,26,28). There is a present condemnation (Rom.5:16,18; 8:1; I Cor.16: 32). The final result is death. (Rom.5:12,14,17,21; 6:16,21, 23; 7:5; 8:2, 6; II Cor.7:10). "Paul does not explicitly

So prays that the Thessalonians may prove to be blameless (I Thess.3:12; 5:23). It will mean destruction for the wicked (I Thess.5:3; II Thess.1:8-10; 2:8). "The day of wrath" is an eschatological term (Rom.2:5; 12:19; I Thess. 1:10; 2:16). It is connected with "the revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom.2:5) upon evil doers. Every man will receive judgment according to his works (Rom.2:6; Eph.6:8; Col.3:24). "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the hearts" (I Cor.4:5). Fire is a symbol of the searching tests of a man's work (I Cor.3:12-15). The judgment in one place is attributed to God. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God." "Each shall give an account of himself to God" (Rom.14:10,12; cf.Mt.2:10). The Christ is also the Judge. "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each may receive the things done in the body according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (II Cor.5:10). Here the thought is of a public trial. But he also thinks of a private or spiritual judgment which is going on in man's lives which is ethical rather than eschatological. God tests man's hearts (I Thess.2:4). If a man chooses sin he is handed over to it (Rom.1:24,26,28). There is a present condemnation (Rom.3:18,19; 3:1; I Cor.14:32). The final result is death. (Rom.5:12,14,17,21; 6:16,21; 7:5; 8:1; 8:2; II Cor.7:10). Trench does not explicitly

distinguish the death of the body from that of the soul."[1] "The sting of death is sin" (I Cor.15:56) which intimates a spiritual punishment and separation from the kingdom of God. "There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom.8:1). There is no irreconcilable dualism between ethical and eschatological judgment in Paul's thought.[2] The former is an exhibition of his great spiritual perception. Destiny is related to character. The latter, while not worked out in detail by Paul who is very sparing in his descriptions of the Great Assize, carries the thought that "at the consummation of the universe all rational beings will receive their due unto the full."[3] Thus the thought of the solidarity of the kingdom enters here, and final destiny is determined by all rather than the individual apart from the community.

There is one passage where the saints are to judge the world (I Cor.6:2). Doubtless Paul took this idea from Jewish thought (cf.Dan.7:22,27) and it was held to be part of the reward of the righteous. "Their award is salvation (Rom.13:11) eternal life (Rom.2:7) glory (II Cor.4:17) an incorruptible crown (Col.9:25) a reigning in life (Rom.5:17."[4] The future fate of the wicked Paul does not dwell upon much.

---

1. McNeile, op.cit., 197.
2. Kennedy, op.cit., 198f.
3. Charles, Eschat., 399.
4. Beckwith, op.cit., 94.

distinguish the death of the body from that of the soul.[1] "The sting of death is sin" (1 Cor.15:56) which intimates a spiritual punishment and separation from the kingdom of God.[2] "There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom.8:1). There is no irreconcilable dualism between ethical and eschatological judgment in Paul's thought. The former is an exhibition of his great spiritual perception. Dealing is related to character. The latter, while not worked out in detail by Paul who is very sparing in his descriptions of the future state, carries the thought that "at the consummation of the universe all rational beings will receive their due unto the full."[3] Thus the thought of the solidarity of the kingdom enters here, and final sentiny is determined by all earlier than the individual apart from the community.

There is one passage where the saints are to judge the world (1 Cor.6:2). Conditions Paul took this idea from Jewish thought (cf.Dan.7:22,27) and it was held to be part of the reward of the righteous. Christ award is salvation (Rom.13:11) eternal life (Rom.6:4) glory (2 Cor.4:17) an incorruptible crown (Col.3:4) a reigning in life (Rom.5:17). The future fate of the wicked Paul does not dwell upon.

---

1. Tillich, op.cit., 197.
2. Kennedy, op.cit., 164.
3. Dawson, Teaches, 300.
4. Tennant, op.cit., 97.

They shall suffer eternal destruction from the face of the Lord (I Thess.1:8). Their end is perdition (Phil.3:19). In regard to any future restoration or probation after death Paul has no direct statements. "On two things only does St. Paul lay stress - that the wicked have no inheritance in the kingdom of God and that they are cleared off the face of the world."[1]

Matthew has a famous judgment scene which, like Paul's, is placed directly at the Parousia (25:31f). That this judgment is near is the common assumption of Paul and Matthew. Holtzmann even assumes that "the nearness of the Kingdom of Heaven (or of God) means for Jesus, as it meant for the Baptist, the nearness of the Judgment."[2] At any rate, the fact of judgment is unquestioned in Matthew (10:15; 11:22, 24). It is part of the teaching of "that day" which was long known in Hebrew teaching. Like Paul, Matthew's conception of the Judgment includes "all the nations." (25:31f). His picture has more dramatic details than Paul's, but the final fate of the wicked and righteous is determined by their works. (7:21; 16:27) This triple emphasis shows the same clear ethical basis that was probably a Christian teaching known to all but which is suggestive of dependence or knowledge between Matthew and Paul. As in Paul, the one who shall judge varies. In the Great Assize it is the Son of Man (cf.

---

1. Morgan, (Art.) Judgment, D.A.C., I, 663.
2. Life of Jesus, 171.

they shall suffer eternal separation from the face of God (I Thess.1:9). Christ and a partition (Eph.2:14). In regard to any future restoration or probation after death Paul has no direct statements. On two occasions only does Paul say aught - that the wicked have no inheritance in the kingdom of God and that they are alienated all the days of the world.[1]

Matthew has a Parable Judgment among Christ, like Paul's, is placed directly at the Parousia (25:31ff). That Matt is this judgment is the common understanding of Paul and Jesus. Matthew even assumes that the destiny of the Kingdom of Heaven (or of God) among for Sheep, as it seems for the Goats, the destiny of the Judgment.[2] As may judge the fact of judgment is unquestioned in Matthew (Matt. 13:49, 24). It is part of the teaching of "that day" which was long known in Hebrew tradition. Like Paul, Matthew's description of the Judgment includes full law nothing. (25:31). His picture has more dramatic details than Paul's, but the final fate of the wicked and righteous is determined by moral norms. (25:31; 16:27). This triple emphasis shows the same other ethical basis that was probably a Christian teaching known to Mt but motion is only suggestive of dependence of some image between Matthew and Paul. As in Paul, the form by which varies. In the Great Parable it is the Son of Man (or

---

1. Thessa. (Pat.) Judgment, p.4.; 2.1.(4)
2. Life of Jesus, 173.

7:22; 16:27). This is Matthew's chief emphasis, but elsewhere (6:4,6,14,18) it is assumed that God will recompense and in the parable of the net the angels will sever the wicked from the righteous and cast them into a furnace of fire (13:49-50). Unlike Paul the share of believers in judging is limited to the twelve apostles who will judge the twelve tribes of Israel (19:28) but here, like Paul, this is a reward for their sacrifice of all things for the kingdom of God. The righteous are to inherit the kingdom. They are blessed of the Father (25:34). They are saved and treasured like wheat (13:30), and shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father (13:43). On the other hand the wicked face a fiery fate originally prepared for the devil and his angels (25:41). They are like tares or bad fish, fit only to be burned (13:30,50). There is an outer darkness to which some of the sons of the kingdom (Jews evidently are meant) will be condemned (8:12). There is a note of finality in the punishment and an exhortation to fear him "who is able to destroy both body and soul in Gehenna (10:28). Here again is similarity to Paul in the conclusiveness of punishment and the lack of reference to any intermediate state or future forgiveness. There is an added somber tinge in Matthew who repeats like a refrain the accompaniment of weeping and gnashing of teeth in the place of perdition (13:42,50; 25:30; 22:13; 8:12). He also fre-

7:22; 13:27). This is Matthew's chief emphasis, as elsewhere (5:4,5,16,18) it is assumed that God will recompense and in the parable of the net the angels will never the wicked from the righteous and cast them into a furnace of fire (13:49-50). Unlike Paul the sphere of believers in judging is limited to the twelve apostles who will judge the twelve tribes of Israel (19:28) but here, like Paul, this is a reward for their sacrifice of all things for the kingdom of God. The righteous are to inherit the kingdom. They are blessed of the Father (25:34). They are saved and transported like Noah (13:36), and shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father (13:43). On the other hand the wicked face a fiery fate originally prepared for the devil and his angels (25:41). They are like tares or bad fish, fit only to be burned (13:30,50). There is an outer darkness to which some of the sons of the kingdom (tare evidently are meant) will be consigned (8:12). There is a note of finality in the punishment and an exhortation by (Jesus) who is able to destroy both body and soul in Gehenna (10:28). Here again is similarity to Paul in the conclusiveness of punishment and the lack of reference to any intermediate state or future forgiveness. There is an added somber tinge in matthew who repeats like a refrain the accompaniment of weeping and gnashing of teeth in the place of perdition (13:42,50; 22:13; 25:30; 25:12; 8:12). He also fre-

quently refers to fire as best descriptive of future unhappiness. This note of retribution and solemnity of fate is stressed more than in Paul though the latter recognizes the seriousness of the fate of the wicked. But Matthew's warnings are carried even to the fine point where "every idle word that men speak they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment" (12:36). The hard sayings about the fate of evil doers are more evident in Matthew than the other Synoptists and "many of these are seen by critical examination to be additions or variations due to editorial working over of the source."[1] This attitude is no doubt one of unconscious misrepresentation[2] on the part of Evangelist but it is beyond question that he found clear teachings of Jesus about the seriousness of sin. "There can be no reasonable doubt that the words and phrases to which reference has been made were introduced by the author of St. Matthew in consequence of his own sense of what was fitting."[3] While eschatology as a whole was not the whole Messianic doctrine of Jesus yet "he envisaged the future in terms of the eschatological symbolism of the coming of the Son of Man and the End of the Age."[4] Matthew more than Paul has leaned to the eschatological interpretation of Jesus' teaching. There is the same note as in

---

1. Beckwith, op.cit., 155.
2. Muirhead, Eschat. of Jesus, 36.
3. Stanton, Gosp.as Hist.Documents, II, 353; cf. Sharman, Teaching of Jesus about the Future, 356.
4. Rawlinson, N.T. Doct. of Christ. 49.

[illegible] refers to this as best descriptive of future un-
happiness. This sense of retribution was strongly of Pope
is stressed more than in Dual though the latter recognizes
the reciprocness of the fate of the wicked. But earthly
warnings are carried even to the Pope point where every
idle word that man speak they shall give an account thereof
in the day of judgment" (18:36). The Dante warnings about the
fate of evil doers are more evident in Gothic than the other
Dynasties and many of these are seen by critical speculat-
ion to be additions or variations due to critical working
over of the source.[4] This attitude is no doubt due of unknown
actions misrepresentation[5] on the part of Dangerfield but is be-
yond question that he found clear examples of Jesus about
the wickedness of sin. There can be no reasonable doubt
that the words and phrases in which reference has been made
were introduced by the author of GL. Whether in consequence
of his own sense of what was fitting,[6] while authorship as
a whole was not the whole Messianic description of Jesus yet he
envisaged the future in terms of the eschatological symbolism
of the coming of the Son of Man and the End of the Age.
Whether here that Dual has learned to the eschatological inter-
pretation of Jesus' teach no. There is the same note as in

---

1. Jaeniish, op. cit., 126.
2. Whitehead, Tochal, of Jesus, 56.
3. Stanton, Gospels as Hist. Documents, II, 263; cf. Bowman,
   Teaching of Jesus about the future, 164.
4. Bartlemen, N.T. Intro. of Jesus, 49.

Paul that there is a present reward (6:2,5; 7:11) for righteous living but there is not the element of mystical blessedness which Paul finds in his conception of life in Christ. Taken as a whole there are remarkable similarities throughout in ideas about the judgment.

Matthew is like Paul in the idea that there are concrete tests of life, which issue eventually in final judgment but which form a continuous judgment in the present moral life. This is the common ethical heritage of early Christian writers. A man's life is judged by his confession of Christ (10:32); by his use of God's gifts (25:14,30); by his lack of repentance at the preaching of one greater than Jonah (12:41); by his judging others (7:2); by hypocrisy (23:13f); by his deeds (16:27). Matthew is pre-eminently the gospel of judgment and throughout his record there is the note of judgment upon the lives of men. There is even a suggestion that evil spirits are doomed to a time of torment (8:29). While neither Matthew nor Paul indulge in elaborate discussions or descriptions of the judgment and each agrees that the future depended on a man's relation to God in Christ, yet while Paul has little place for the judgment in his plan of the End, Matthew clearly provides an important place for it. The latter stands alone in his condemnation of the Pharisees. "How shall ye escape the judgment of Gehenna (hell)?" (23:33) "a product of Matthean tendency".[1]

---

1. Cf. Sharman, op.cit., 225-226.

"Jewish Apocalyptic, albeit bizarre to modern eyes, was no ignoble thing. The eternal optimism, which is of the essence of true religion, expresses itself in different forms in different epochs. To men appalled alike by the corruption and by the irresistible might of Roman civilization, and inheriting the previous religious history of Israel and her prophets, it was an heroic confidence in the Divine intention to regenerate the world that found its most natural expression in terms of the Messianic hope apocalyptically conceived."[1] In this belief of the final triumph of righteousness both Matthew and Paul believed. The latter has stated his faith in his First Corinthian letter (15:20-28). Since Christ has been raised from the dead, those who believe in him will also be made alive at his coming. "Then cometh the end when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power.....and when all things have been subjected unto him then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all." "At the remotest distance of the horizon swept by the Apostle's prophetic vision we still see the glory of the unfathomable, immeasurable certainty. God is all in all."[2]

---

1. Streeter, Oxford Stud. Synop. Problem, 434.
2. Deissmann, Paul, 219.

"Jewish Apocalyptic, albeit bizarre to modern eyes, was no lunatic fringe. The eternal optimism, which is of the essence of true religion, approaches itself in different forms in different epochs. To men appalled alike by the corruption and by the irresistible sweep of Roman civilization, and inheriting the previous religious history of Israel and our prophets, it was an heroic confidence in the Divine Intention to regenerate the world that found its most natural expression in terms of the messianic hope apocalyptically conceived."[1] In this belief at the final triumph of righteousness both Jesus and Paul believed. The latter has stated his faith in his First Corinthian letter (15:20-22). Since Christ has been raised from the dead, those who believe in him will also be made alive at his coming. "Then comes the end when he shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power..... and when all things have been subjected unto him then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all."

"At the furthest extreme of the horizon seen by the Apocalyptic prophetic vision we still see the glory of the unfathomable, immeasurable certainty, 'God is all in all.'"

---

1. Streeter, Oxford Stud. Synop. Problem. 444.
2. Schweitzer, Gesch. Leben. 210.

"The universe is one reconciled to God in all its parts. If the demoniac powers are not ultimately reconciled as in one passage he seems to indicate (Col.1:19) they are abolished (I Cor.15:24). God becomes all and in all."[1] Matthew, only of the gospels, writes of a regeneration παλιγγενεσία 19:28). If the word is "distinctly Greek and cannot be literally translated either into Hebrew or Aramaic, it must be attributed to the evangelist himself."[2] In idea it is closely related to Paul's "new creation" καινὴ κτίσις , (Gal.6:15; II Cor.5:17) except that the latter is personal while Matthew has in mind a new world or a transformation of the old one[3] but both agree in the idea that God is responsible for newness of life. "Heaven and earth shall pass away" (Mt.5:18; 24:35), hence there will be a world renewal. The end of the age (13:39; 28:20) will mark the beginning of another new age. That the new life will be of a spiritual order (and not materialistic as in Jewish conceptions)[4] is clear both in Matthew (22:30) and Paul (I Cor.15:44)[5]. Both locate the new age after the Parousia. There is in the gospel no room for "an interregnum, a period of Messianic rule of limited duration."[6]

---

1. Morgan,(Art.) Judgment,D.A.C.,I,663; cf.Dodd, Meaning of Paul for Today, 40.
2. Dalman, Words of Jesus, 177; Jackson, op.cit., 48.
3. McNeile, St. Mt., 281.
4. Thackeray, op.cit., 127.
5. Stanton, Jew. and Christian Messiah, 352.
6. Jackson, op.cit., 111.

"The universe is one reconciled to God in all its parts. If the demonic powers are not ultimately reconciled as in one passage Col seems to indicate (Col.1:16) they are subjugated (1 Cor.15:24). God becomes all and in all,[1] Christ, only of the gospels, writes of a regeneration (Mt.19:28). If the word is literally Greek and cannot be literally translated either into Hebrew or Aramaic, it must be attributed to the evangelist himself. In less it is closely related to Paul's "new creation" (2 Cor.5:17) except that the latter is personal while Matthew has in mind a new world or a transformation of the old one[2] but both agree in the idea that God is responsible for renewal of life. "Heaven and earth shall pass away" (Mt.24:35), hence there will be a world renewal. The end of the age (Mt.28:20; 24:3) will mark the beginning of another new age. That the new life will be of a spiritual order (and not materialistic as in Jewish conceptions)[3] is clear both in Matthew (22:30) and Paul (1 Cor.15:44)[4]. Both locate the new age after the Parousia. There is in the gospel no room for "an intermediate, a period of Messianic rule of limited duration."[5]

---

1. Morgan, Dan. J. Dupont, C.S.B., L'Esprit de Dieu, Meaning of Paul for Today, 1969.
2. Dalman, Words of Jesus, 177; Jackson, op.cit., 48.
3. McNeile, St. Mt., 280.
4. Thackeray, op.cit., 149.
5. Stauffer, Jes. und Christlicher Glaube, 38.
6. Jackson, op.cit., 111.

Whether Paul thought of a period between the Parousia and the final end cannot be clearly determined. (I Cor.15: 24).[1] Neither writer has given an ordered program of various eschatological events.[2]

Both authors hold that the final age will see the universal kingdom of God in sway. They exemplify the well known belief that the kingdom is present and coming.[3] The catastrophic establishment of the kingdom is mixed with the spiritual coming. The latter has been discussed in an earlier section. The point here is the eschatological kingdom. Paul uses kingdom of God in an eschatological connotation several times (I Thess.2:12; II Thess.1:5; I Cor.15:24, 50; Gal.5:21; cf.Phil.3:20). "A belief in the appearance of the kingdom, is one of the assumptions which the entire Pauline literature makes and the hope of sharing in it becomes the basis of ethical appeal"[4] (Rom.14:17; I Cor.4:20; 6:9,10; Gal.5:21; Col.1:13; Eph.5:5; cf.Rom.8:17). That Paul thought of Christ as transferring the kingdom to the Father at the final consummation cannot be denied (I Cor. 15:24-25) but it does not follow that in his thought there was a distinction in essence between kingdom of Christ and

---

1. Morgan, (op.cit., 235) thinks it in highest degree probable, though Paul does not mention it.
2. Cf. Morgan, op.cit., 238.
3. Mathew's, op.cit., 81.
4. Ibid, 164; cf. Wendt, Tchg. of Jesus, I, 405.

another Paul thought of a period between the Parousia and the final end cannot be clearly determined. (1 Cor.15:24).[1] Scholar writer has given an ordered program of various eschatological events.[2]

Both authors hold that the final age will see the universal kingdom of God in sway. They accordingly well known belief that the kingdom is present and coming. The eschatologia establishment of the kingdom is mixed with the spiritual coming. The latter has been discussed in an earlier section. The point here is the eschatological kingdom. Paul uses kingdom of God in an eschatological connection several times (1 Thess.2:12; 2 Thess.1:5; 1 Cor.15:24; Col.3:24; cf.Phil.3:20). "A belief in the appearance of the kingdom, is one of the assumptions which the entire Pauline literature makes and the hope of sharing in it becomes the basis of ethical appeal."[3] (Rom.14:17; 1 Cor.4:20; 6:9,10; Gal.5:21; Col.1:13; cf.Rom.1:17). That Paul thought of Christ as transferring the kingdom to the Father at the final consummation cannot be denied (1 Cor. 15:24-28) but it does not follow that in his thought there was a distinction in essence between kingdom of Christ and

---

1. Morgan, op.cit., 223) places it in higher degree probable, though Paul does not mention it.
2. Cf. Morgan, op.cit., 223.
3. Bultmann's, op.cit., 42.
4. Cold, 104; cf. Wendt, Teaching of Jesus, I, 165.

kingdom of God.[1] But he and Matthew agree in regarding Jesus as having a special work to do in the establishment of the kingdom on earth. In Matthew (13:41-43) the Son of Man is to send forth his angels "to gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling and them that do iniquity." "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." This is very similar to Paul's thought of Jesus' handing over the kingdom to God even the Father after all enemies have been abolished (I Cor.15:24).[2]

There is no detailed description of the future kingdom either in Paul or Matthew. In each the main thought is of a glorious life.[3] "We rejoice in hope of the glory of God" (Rom.5:2). "It is raised in glory" (I Cor.15:43). Even the creation itself will be delivered "into the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (Rom.8:21). God will make known the riches of his glory (Rom.9:23). The present sufferings are not to be compared to the glory that shall be revealed (Rom.9:18). If believers suffer with Christ they will be glorified with him. (Rom.8:17) They are to receive an incorruptible crown (I Cor.9:25). The elect are to share

---

1. Cf. Ibid, 77, 165, cf. Kennedy, op.cit., 289-290.
2. Cf. Dewick (op.cit., 280) who mistakenly holds to an interim for the kingdom of Christ.
3. "The most universal but most pregnant word for participation in the Messianic Age is to <u>live</u>. The saved are described as <u>viventes</u>." Scott, The Fellowship of the Spirit, 48; cf. Bousset, Relig. des Judentums, 263; Volz, Jüd. Eschat., 306.

kingdom of God.[1] Yet we need nothing more in searching for Jesus as having a special work to do in the establishment of the kingdom on earth. In Matthew (Luke-xx) the Son of Man is to sent forth His angels to gather out of His kingdom all things that cause stumbling and those that do iniquity. Then shall the righteous shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.[2] This is very similar to Paul's thought of Jesus' reigning over the kingdom to God even the Father after all enemies have been subjugated (I Cor.15:24).

There is no detailed description of the future kingdom either in Paul or Matthew. In each the main thought is of a glorious life. The resolve in hope of the glory of God" (Rom.5:2). "It is raised in glory" (I Cor.15:43). Even the creation itself will be delivered "into the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (Rom.8:21). Not only that known the riches of His glory (Rom.9:23). The present sufferings are not to be compared to the glory that shall be revealed (Rom.8:18). If believers suffer with Christ they will be glorified with Him. (Rom.8:17) They are to receive an incorruptible crown (I Cor.9:25). The elect are to share

---

1. Cf. Ibid. 22, 10b, cf. Kummel, op.cit., 221-222.
2. Cf. Beasley for.cit., 230) who alternatively holds to an interim for the kingdom of Christ.
3. The best universal but most frequent word for participation in the Messianic Age is to live. The saved are described as living. Scott, the Relationship of the Spirit, 40; cf. Bousset, Religi. des Judentums, 343; Weiss, Ibid. Leonhard., 24f.

with Christ in his great glory (Mt.24:30-31). The righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom (13:43). They shall see God (6:8). They will share the future with Christ as joint heirs (Rom.8:17 cf. I Cor.1:9; Gal.4:7). They will reign in life through Jesus Christ (Rom.5:7 cf. I Cor.4:8). There will be an immediate and perfect communion with Christ. At present "we walk by faith and not by sight" (II Cor.5:7) but in the future we shall see "face to face" (I Cor.13:12). This particular communal element in the future life is practically absent from Matthew because he does not have the mystical doctrine of Paul but he does regard the future as a time of fellowship with the Son of Man in his glory (16:28).

Paul has some elements in his conception of the future kingdom which are not found in Matthew. As a result of their perfect communion with Christ they will have full knowledge.[1] Knowledge is partial now but then it will be complete (I Cor.13:12). Participants in God's wisdom will share blessings unknown to rulers of this world, things transcending the eye and ear and heart of man here, but which God prepared for them that love him (I Cor.2:9). Matthew quite probably thought of the kingdom in the current picturesque terms of Jewish apocalyptic but Paul passed to a transcendent view because of his conception of the spirit. There will be an eternal and incorruptible glory which flesh

---

1. Beblavý, op.cit., 100f.

him Christ in his great glory (Mt. 24:29-31). The righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom (13:43). They shall see God (5:8). They will share the nature with Christ as joint heirs (Rom. 8:17 cf. 1 Cor. 15:49; Col. 3:3). They will reign in life through Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:17 cf. 1 Cor. 4:8). There will be an immediate and perfect communion with Christ. At present "we walk by faith and not by sight" (2 Cor. 5:7) but in the future we shall see "face to face" (1 Cor. 13:12). This particular eschatical element in the future life is practically absent from Matthew because he does not note the spiritual doctrine of Paul but he does regard the future as a time of fellowship with the Son of Man in His glory (19:28).

Paul has some elements in his conception of the future kingdom which are but found in Matthew. As a result of their perfect communion with Christ they will have full knowledge.[1] Knowledge is partial now but then it will be complete (1 Cor. 13:12). Participants in God's heaven will share glorious authority in judging of this world. Things transcending the eye and ear and heart of man here, God has not prepared for those that love him (1 Cor. 2:9). Matthew quite probably thought of the kingdom in the current eschatological terms of Jewish apocalyptic but Paul passed to a transcendental view because of his conception of the spirit. There will be an eternal and incorruptible glory which takes

---

1. Dahlberg, op.cit., 1908.

and blood cannot inherit (I Cor.15:50). Once fully possessed of the spirit the servitude in the body will be broken and there will be full spiritual liberty (Rom.8:23; II Cor. 3:17). There will be a life without end because it has passed beyond temporal and corruptible existence (Rom.2:7; 5:21; 6:22,23; Gal.6:8). These possessions are already partly in the lives of believers. (II Cor.1:22; 5:5; Rom.8:23) But the completion lies in the future. "C'est là que sera réalisée la pleine gloire, la paix, la joie, la puissance, la connaissance, l'incorruptibilité et la vie eternelle."[1]

In the future kingdom there will be angels who share the life and glory. Both Matthew and Paul provide them as celestial attendants (Gal.1:8) to the glory of God and Christ (Mt.24:31). Since God will be all in all the future life will be a glorification of him. In all of Paul's doxologies he gives glory to God both now and forever.

The enemies of good are described by Matthew as driven from the presence of God to the final fate of eonian punishment (24-46). The last enemy to be conquered is death (I Cor.15:26). Paul has his main attention centered on the blessedness of the community life with God. The certainty of the future bliss fills his mind. Those who refuse to accept life in Christ will not share in the kingdom. Whether Paul believes, like Matthew in their eternal punishment or in their

---

1. Beblavý, op.cit., 102.

and blood cannot inherit (I Cor.15:50). Once fully possessed of the spirit the servitude in the body will be broken and there will be full spiritual liberty (Rom.8:20; II Cor. 3:17). There will be a life without end because it has passed beyond temporal and corruptible existence (Rom.2:7; 6:23; Gal.6:8). These possessions are already partly in the lives of believers. (II Cor.1:22; 5:5; Rom.8:23) But the completion lies in the future. "O'er is one area realizes in vision glorious, in peace, in joy, in patience, in assurance, i'immortality'ability et la vie eternelle."[1]

To the future kingdom there will be people who share the life was glory. Both Satchev and Paul prevailed them as original attendance (Gal.2:8) in the glory of God and Christ (Ga.24:25). Since God will be all in all the future life will be a glorification of him. In all of Paul's doxologies he gives glory to God both now and forever.

The symbols of good are described by Satchev as arisen from the presence of God in the final fate of evilon punishment (24-46). The part above to be compared is death (I Cor.15:26). Paul has his main attention centered on the blessedness of the community life with God. The certainty of the future bliss fills his mind. Those who refuse to accept life in Christ will not share in the kingdom. Whether Paul believes, like Satchev in their eternal punishment or in their

---

1. Tagbaev, op.cit., 102.

annihilation will always be a moot point. He does not have the Gehenna of fire that Matthew does (5:22; 18:9; 13: 42,50).[1] Both think of the fate of the wicked as one of spiritual punishment though Matthew paints pictures in symbolic terms of fire and outer darkness. The final doom of the wicked is more strongly felt by Matthew. Paul's life in the Spirit was so aboundingly real that its importance, rather than the fate of the wicked, was always first in his mind.

There was an increasing tendency in Paul, not found so much in Matthew to subsume the idea of a kingdom supernaturally induced and manifested in miracle under the yet larger idea of a kingdom that did not cease to be supernaturally induced though it found its expression in the still small voice of conscience.[2] Hence Paul regarded Christ not only as one to come in glory in his kingdom in the future consummation but also as one who shared life in the spirit with believers. This present emphasis did not contradict the future manifestation of Christ but it became increasingly the main thought in the Pauline ideas whereas Matthew emphasized the future. When Matthew thinks of the future he has the Son of Man in an apocalyptic sense in mind. Out of thirty-two

---

1. Cf. Charles, Eschat., 417.
2. Cf. Sanday, Hib.Jour. X, 102; Deissmann (Paul,219) names these two strains in Paul, "Eastern (native Jewish) and Western (Hellenistic-cosmopolitan)."

occurrences of the term fourteen are apocalyptic.[1] This double use of Son of Man, with special emphasis on the apocalyptic element is best understood when its origin is remembered.[2] In Daniel (Ch.7) the term had its origin and is used indefinitely as symbolical of Israel. In Enoch the usage is definite and means a supernatural person with superhuman attributes of superhuman glory and with universal dominion and supreme judicial powers. In the gospels, especially in Jesus' use, a spiritual significance was added based upon the Isaiah conception of the Servant of the Lord. This synthesis explains the double use in Matthew who retained and emphasized the Enochic conception. The glorious future belonged to the Son of Man. Paul did not use this term because for him the future was already apprehended in Christ. The Christian both is and is to be like Christ. Paul has a mystical Christology whereas Matthew's is apocalyptic and in their doctrines of the future these different conceptions while based on a common Jewish Christian ground, tend in opposing directions. Paul did not care enough for the book of Enoch to stress its conceptions of the apocalyptic Son of Man.[3] Man's part and responsibility in the future consummation is an element that was not in Jewish apocalyptic and is largely due to Paul's

---

1. Cf. Muirhead, op.cit., 218.
2. Cf. Charles, The Book of Enoch, 307-309.
3. Cf. Porter, (op.cit.,190) who criticises Charles for holding that Paul knew and used Enoch.

occurrences of the term Superman are apocalyptic.[1] This double use of Son of Man, with special emphasis on the apocalyptic element is best understood when its origin is considered.[2] In Daniel 7:13 the term had its origin and is used indefinitely as symbolical of Israel. In Enoch the usage is definite and means a supernatural person with supernatural attributes of superhuman glory and with universal dominion and supreme judicial power. In the gospels, especially in Luke's view, a spiritual significance was added based upon the Isaiah conception of the Servant of the Lord. This synthesis explains the double use in Matthew who retained and combinated the Enochic conception. The glorious future belonged to the Son of Man. Paul did not use this term because for him the future was already apprehended in Christ. The Christian hope and is to be like Christ. Paul has a soteriological Christology whereas Matthew's is apocalyptic and in their contrasts of the future these different conceptions which based on a common Jewish Christian ground, tend in opposing directions. Paul did not care enough for the book of Enoch to express his conceptions of the apocalyptic Son of Man.[3] Jesus's responsibility in the future consummation is the interest that was not in Jesus apocalyptic and is theological to Paul's

---

1. Cf. Manchester, op. cit., 1928.
2. Cf. Charles, The Book of Enoch, 307-320.
3. Cf. Porter, (op. cit., 1921) who criticizes Charles for stating that Paul knew and used Enoch.

interpretation,[1] which in turn was based on the ethical and religious teaching of his Master. This responsibility is not for a time only but has eternal significance. "Neither our Lord nor Paul...really preached an Interimsethik."[2]

The value of this apocalyptic teaching which played so large a role in New Testament times and thinking has been well stated by Streeter.[3] "The summits of certain mountains are seen only at rare moments when, their cloud cap rolled away, they stand out stark and clear. So in ordinary life ultimate values and eternal issues are normally obscured by minor duties, petty cares and small ambitions; at the bedside of a dying man, the cloud is often lifted. In virtue of the eschatological hope our Lord and His first disciples found themselves standing, as it were, at the bedside of a dying world. Thus for a whole generation the cloud of lesser interests was rolled away, and ultimate values and eternal issues stood out before them stark and clear, as never before or since in the history of our race. The majority of men in all ages best serve their kind by a life of quiet duty, in the family, in their daily work, and in the support, of certain definite and limited public and philanthropic causes. Such is the normal way of progress. But it has been well for humanity that during one great epoch the

---

1. Ibid, 204.
2. Sanday, op.cit., 103.
3. Foundations, 119-120.

interpretation,[4] which in turn are based on the ultimate and religious teaching of his Master. This responsibility is not for a time only but has eternal significance. "Neither our love nor fear...really preached on Christianity."[5]

The value of this apocalyptic teaching which played so large a role in her Christian views and thinking has been well stated by Streeter.[6] "The summits of certain mountains are seen only at rare moments when, after cloud cap rolled away, they stand out stark and clear. So in ordinary life ultimate values and eternal issues are normally obscured by minor duties, petty cares and small anxieties; at the bedside of a dying man, the cloud is often lifted. In views of the eschatological hope our lord and His first disciples found themselves standing, as it were, at the bedside of a dying world. Thus for a whole generation the cloud of lesser interests was rolled away, and ultimate values and eternal issues stood out before them stark and clear, as never before or since in the history of our race. The majority of men in all ages best serve their aims by a life of quiet duty, in the family, in their daily work, and in the support, of certain definite and limited public and philanthropic causes. Such is the normal way of progress. But it has been well for humanity that during one great epoch the

---

4. Ibid., 204.
5. Sanday, op.cit., 105.
6. Foundations, 113-114.

belief that the end of all was near turned the thoughts of the highest minds away from practical and local interests, even of the first importance like the condition of slaves in Capernaum or the sanitation of Tarsus." "Paul for himself drew many practical inferences from the nearness of the end of the world (e.g. that it was better for him not to marry), but his longing in Christ for the new world, though enthusiastic and ardent to a degree that makes the comfortable paper eschatology of our dogmatic shrivel up to nothing in comparison, did not generate into an unhealthy and barren chiliasm or quietism. On the contrary it set free moral forces to act on this passing world. Certainly without the hope of Christ, Paul would not have become famous in history as the man of action, the Apostle of Christ."[1]

In summarizing the positions of Paul and Matthew in regard to eschatology it can be seen that there are remarkable parallels both in terminology and ideas. This is especially evident in their conceptions of the Parousia, and the Judgment. In the signs of the end Paul has a "man of sin" unmentioned by Matthew. In the Resurrection Paul has a more spiritual conception of the future body. In the Judgment Paul stresses less the fate of the wicked. In the final consummation, Paul sees a mystical communion with

---

1. Deissmann, op.cit., 219-220.

belief that the end of all was near turned the thoughts of the highest minds away from practical and local interests, even of the first importance like the condition of slaves in Gogarnum or the sanitation of Tarsus." Paul for himself drew many practical inferences from the nearness of the end of the world (e.g. that it was better for him not to marry), but his longing in Corinth for the new world, though enthusiastic and ardent to a degree that makes the comfortable paper eschatology of our dogmatic shrivel up to nothing in comparison, did not generate into an unreality and barren ecstasy or quietism. On the contrary it set free moral forces to act on this passing world. Certainly without the hope of Christ, Paul would not have become famous in history as the man of action, the Apostle of Christ.[1]

In summarizing the positions of Paul and Matthew in regard to eschatology it can be seen that there are remarkable parallels both in terminology and ideas. This is especially evident in their conceptions of the Parousia, and the Judgment. In the signs of the end Paul has a mean of sin unmentioned by Matthew. In the Resurrection Paul has a more spiritual conception of the future body. In the Judgment Paul stresses less the fate of the wicked. In the final consummation, Paul sees a mystical communion with

---

1. Toldemann, op.cit., 210-220.

Christ, experienced in the present and fully perfected in the future, that is not clearly developed in Matthew. Moreover in view of this mysticism Paul's emphasis on apocalyptic tended to decrease while Matthew increases apocalyptic hopes. But when the above differences have been stated there still remains a remarkable similarity in general outlook and eschatological details. They agree on all five main concepts: The Present and Future Age, the Parousia, the Resurrection, the Judgment and the final Consummation. Matthew stands nearer to Paul in eschatological terminology than either of the other Synoptics. The facts indicate that Paul and Matthew used not only common Jewish Christian eschatological ideas, but that Matthew has used ideas which Paul had stated and made current in Christian circles.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY.

The results of this investigation of the influence of Pauline theology in the gospel of Matthew may be briefly stated as follows:

1. Contrary to the claim of the Tubingen school followed by scholars like Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, Bacon and Bosworth there is no anti-Paulinism in Matthew.

2. On the other hand contrary to the views of writers like Drews, Wrede, Piepenbring and Klausner, Matthew is not permeated throughout by Paulinism.

3. In Christology, the evidence is too slight to indicate distinctively Pauline thought with the exception of one notable passage (Mt.11:25-30). In this passage which stresses a unique Father-Son relation and in the general tendency to exalt Jesus there are similarities marked enough to indicate a moderate Pauline influence.

4. In Soteriology, there are considerable divergences in the outlook of Paul and Matthew but there are also a number of similarities. In one passage at least (18:6) ("believe on me") Matthew appears to have had contact with a Pauline concept.

5. In attitude toward the Law Matthew and Paul are notably different.

6. In regard to the Gospel, Paul's varied ideas are not reflected in Matthew enough to indicate influence.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

Conversion and Sublimation.

The results of this investigation of the influence of Pauline Christology in the gospel of Matthew may be briefly stated as follows:

1. Contrary to the views of the Tubingen school (followed by scholars like Strachan, Chilcote, Moore and Goodwin) there is no anti-Paulinism in Matthew.

2. On the other hand contrary to the views of writers like Dawes, Weiss, Plummer and Klausner, Matthew is not permeated throughout by Paulinism.

3. In Christology, the influence in the minor to indicate that intuitively Paulinic thought with the exception of one notable passage (Mt. 11:27-28). In this passage which stresses a unique Father-Son relation and in the general tendency to exalt Jesus there are christological motifs enough to indicate a moderate Pauline influence.

4. In Soteriology, there are considerable divergences in the outlook of Paul and Matthew but there are also a number of similarities. In one passage at least (18:6) "Believe on me") Matthew appears to have had contact with a Pauline concept.

5. In attitude toward the Law Matthew and Paul are totally different.

6. In regard to the Church, Paul's varied ideas are not reflected in Matthew enough to indicate influence.

7. There is similarity in Sacramental ideas; although the evidence is not decisive, there appear to be reflections in Matthew of Pauline ideas.

8. Paul and Matthew have many ideas in common about the Church and its cognates but clear proof of Pauline concepts is lacking.

9. There are contrasting tendencies, rather than identity, when each writer considers the Disciples and Apostles.

10. The universalistic attitude of Matthew in regard to Jews and Gentiles is most probably due to Pauline emphasis.

11. Matthew pursued an independent course in his use of the Old Testament.

12. Matthew and Paul are alike in a fundamental Christian Ethical Outlook based upon Jesus' teachings. Except for a celibate attitude, where Paul's thought may be present but cannot be proved, there is no clear evidence of Pauline influence.

13. In Eschatology, Matthew appears to have emphasized some phrases and ideas which Paul had used earlier but which were derived from a Jewish Christian source. Paul has a tendency toward mystical and spiritual aspects of the future while Matthew lays stress on apocalyptic.

14. The literary parallels in Paul and Matthew are remarkable in number. This fact is due partly to a common Christian vocabulary and partly to Pauline words and phrases

7. There is similarity in *Instrumental Issues*; although the evidence is not decisive, there appear to be reflections in Matthew of Pauline issues.

8. Paul and Matthew have many items in common about the *Church* and its organization but clear proof of Pauline concepts is lacking.

9. There are contrasting emphases, rather than identity, when each writer considers the *Disciples* and *Apostles*.

10. The universalistic attitude of Matthew in regard to *Jews* and *Gentiles* is most probably due to Pauline emphasis.

11. Matthew pursued an independent course in his use of the *Old Testament*.

12. Matthew and Paul are alike in a fundamental Christian *Ethical Outlook* based upon Jesus' teachings. Except for a militate attitude, where Paul's thought may be present but cannot be proved, there is no clear evidence of Pauline influence.

13. In *Eschatology*, Matthew appears to have emphasized some phrases and ideas which Paul has used earlier yet which were derived from a Jewish Christian source. Paul has a tendency toward mystical and spiritual aspects of the future while Matthew lays stress on apocalyptic.

14. The *Literary parallels* in Paul and Matthew are remarkable in number. This fact is due partly to a common Christian vocabulary and partly to Pauline words and phrases

which were floating on the stream of Christian thought when Matthew wrote, although he used them sparingly.

15. Though a limited Pauline influence is apparent in Matthew, as shown in preceding prints, contrasting attitudes may be found. Paul does not use "Son of Man". Matthew has no theory of sinful flesh and very little that can be called Christ-mysticism; also Paul's stress on grace is absent. Considerable divergences appear regarding the Law.[1] Matthew tends to exalt Peter and the Apostleship of the Twelve and is sparing in his use of the word "apostle". Paul frequently uses the term "apostle" and holds a spiritual conception of its possibilities. Matthew is more severe toward the leaders of the Jewish people. There are strikingly few of the many Old Testament quotations which appear in both writers. Matthew increases apocalyptic hopes while Paul abates such ideas, especially in later letters.

In summary, it must be maintained that insufficient and indecisive evidence frequently does not permit dogmatic statements about Paul and Matthew. Each writer has used a common stock of primitive Christian concepts. Each writer has a marked individuality, but Matthew, who did not hesitate to use any materials or ideas at hand, has written his gospel partially under the influence of Pauline

---

1. For details, see above p.106f.

which were flowing on the stream of Christian thought, which Matthew wrote, although he used them sparingly.

15. Though a limited Pauline influence is apparent in Matthew, as shown in preceding pages, contrasting attitudes may be found. Paul does not use "Son of Man". Matthew has no theory of sinful flesh and very little that can be called Christ-mysticism; also Paul's stress on grace is absent. Considerable divergences appear regarding the law.[1] Matthew tends to exalt Peter and the Apostleship of the Twelve and is sparing in his use of the word "apostle". Paul frequently uses the term "apostle" and holds a spiritual conception of its possibilities. Matthew is more severe toward the leaders of the Jewish people. There are strikingly few of the many Old Testament quotations which appear in both writers. Matthew increases eschatolytic hope while Paul shelves such ideas, especially in later letters.

In sum, it must be maintained that impressive and indicative evidence from merely some not-minute doctrinal statements about Paul and Matthew. Each writer has used a certain stock of primitive Christian concepts. Each writer has a marked individuality. Yet Matthew, who did not hesitate to use any material at hand, has written his gospel partially under the influence of Pauline

---

1. For details, see above p.[illegible]

ideas which had been circulating for twenty years previous in Gentile Christianity (e.g., Antioch), and which had inevitably molded in part the thinking of early Christianity. The limited Pauline usage in Matthew is not consciously adopted by him. There is neither polemic nor apologetic in regard to Paul. Both Matthew and Paul are supremely interested in interpreting the life and work of Jesus for the benefit of their readers and it is in the points centering about the facts concerning Jesus that the similarity is most marked. Undesignedly Matthew availed himself of ideas or interpretations, Pauline or otherwise, in order to help to make his gospel the great record of Jesus that it is. He did not read Paul's letters but he wrote in an atmosphere where Pauline formulations of thought, e.g. oral teachings, had been known and he used them whenever he found them useful with no thought that they were other than in accord with the truth of the good news which he was recording.

Allen[1] has an excellent discussion of the representation of Christ's teaching as found in Matthew. He feels that the paradoxical elements demand some explanation. He shows that the teaching of Jesus was many-sided and often in the form of paradox and symbol. The earliest tradition, oral then written, was that of the Jerusalem church, which naturally selected the teachings which had immediate bearing upon

---

1. St. Matthew, 320.

the lives of its members. "Paradox may sometimes have been interpreted as an expression of literal truth, symbol as reality, and to some extent, though not, I think, to any great extent, the sayings in transmission may have received accretions arising out of necessities of the Palestinian Church life. Thus the representation of Christ's teaching in this gospel suffers probably from being local in character. In the meantime much of Christ's teaching remained uncommitted to writing; and not until St. Paul's teaching had made men see that Palestinian Christianity suffered in some respects from a too one-sided representation of Christ's teaching, did they go back to the utterances of Christ and re-interpret them from a wider point of view; seeking out also other traditions of different aspects of his teaching which had been neglected by the Palestinian guardian of His words." Thus it appears that Pauline influence has had something to do with the gospel formation and especially those elements in Matthew which are not specifically Jewish-Christian.

"He who knows how to read and understand will ever be charmed anew by the power of personally experienced religion in the very refined, spiritual and imperishable form in which it meets us in the Pauline letters. That which constitutes the greatness and value of the gospels--inwardness, belief in the Father, the worth of man's soul,

love and the close union of religion with ethics -- all this is vitally experienced by Paul and is freshly and insistently expounded."[1] That such a religious genius should make his influence felt on the gospel writers, especially in the interpretation of Jesus, is not strange. Rather the wonder is that his influence is so limited even in the Gospel according to Matthew which "is the loveliest as well as the most important book in the world"[2] -- a primacy to which its position in the New Testament is an abiding witness.

---

1. Knopf, Paul and Hellenism, A.J.T., XVIII, 520.
2. Findlay, Jesus in the First Gospel, 7.

Bibliography

1. Apart from self evident abbreviations, the following abbreviations are used:

A.J.T.	American Journal of Theology.
D.A.C.	Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.
D.C.G.	Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.
Ency.Bib.	Encyclopedia Biblica.
H.B.D.	Hastings Bible Dictionary.
Hib.Jour.	Hibbert Journal.
J.B.L.	Journal of Biblical Literature.
J.D.T.	Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.
J.T.S.	Journal of Theological Studies.
T.S.K.	Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
Z.K.W.	Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft.
Z.N.T.W.	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.

2. When more than one edition of a book has been issued all references to books in the footnotes are to the last editions unless otherwise noted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott,E.A., The Son of Man, Cambridge: Camb.Univ.Press, 1910

Abbott,T.K., Commentary--Ephesians and Colossians, N.Y.: Scribners, 1897.

Abrahams,I., Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Cambridge: Camb.Univ.Press, 1917.

Alexander,A.B.D., The Ethics of St.Paul, Glasgow: Maclehose, 1910.

Allen, W.C., Gospel Acc.to St.Matthew, N.Y.: Scribner's, 1907.

Allen, W.C., Matthew (Art.) Dict. Christ and the Gospels, N.Y.: Scribners, 1908. II,143-150.

Allen, W.C., Old Testament Quotations in Matthew and Mark,(Art.) Expos. Times, XII, (1900-01), 281-285.

Appel, H., Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Leipzig: Deichert, 1922.

Appel, H., Der Sohn des Menschen, Stavenhagen: Beholtz, 1896.

Bacon,B.W., The Apostolic Message, N.Y.: Century, 1925.

Bacon,B.W., The Beginnings of the Gospel Story, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1909.

Bacon,B.W., The Gospel of Mark: Its Date & Composition, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1925.

Bacon,B.W., An Introduction to the New Testament, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1900.

Bacon,B.W., Jesus or Christ, Hibbert Jour. Supplement for 1909. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1909.

Bacon,B.W., Jesus and Paul, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1921.

Bacon,B.W., Jesus the Son of God, New Haven: Yale U.Press, 1911.

Bacon,B.W., Making of the New Testament, Lond: Williams & Norgate, undated.

Bacon,B.W., The Son of Man in the Usage of Jesus, (Art.) Jour. Bib.Lit., XLI, 1922, 143-182.

Bacon, B.W., The Son as Organ of Revelation, (Art.) Harv. Theol.Rev., LX, 4, (Oct. 1916) 382-415.

Bacon, B.W., The Story of Jesus, N.Y.: Century, 1927.

Bacon, B.W., The Story of St.Paul, Bost.: Houghton, Mifflin, 1904.

Bacon, B.W., Wisdom, (Art.) Dict.Christ and Gospel, II, 825-9.

Banks, J.S., St.Paul and the Gospels, (Art.) Exp.Times, V. 9, 413-415.

Barth, F., Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Güterloh: Bertelsmann, 1908.

Bartlett, J.V., Matthew, (Art.) H.B.D., III, 296-305.

Baur, F.C., Kritische Untersuchungen uber die kanonischen Evangelien, Tubingen: Fues, 1847.

Baur, F.C., Neutestamentliche Theologie, Leipzig: Fues, 1864.

Baur, F.C., Paul, His Life & Works, 2 ed. 2 vol. tr. E. Zeller. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1873.

Baur, F.C., Das Urchristentum, Tubingen: Fues, 1853. Tr. Menzies, A Church History of the First Three Centuries, 2 vol. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1878-9.

Beblavý, J., Les Idées Eschatologiques de St.Paul et des Pères Apostoliques, Alencon: Corbiere et Jugoin, 1924.

Beckwith, I.T., Apocalypse of John, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1919.

Benz, K., Die Stellung Jesu zum Altestatentlichen Gesetz, Biblischen Studien, XIX, Band 1 Heft. Freiburg: Herder, 1914.

Berguer, G., Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus, Tr. E.S. & V.W., Brooks, N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, 1923.

Beyschlag, W., New Testament Theology, 2 vol. Tr. Buchanan, N. Edinburgh: Clark, 1895.

Bezzant, J.S., Sacraments in Acts and the Pauline Epistles, (Art.) The Modern Churchman, XVI, 6,7,8, 336-362. (Oct. 1926).

Böhlig, H., Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., 1913, XIV, 23-37.

Bosworth,E.I.,Life and Teaching of Jesus, N.Y.: Macmillan,1924.

Bousset,W., Kyrios Christos, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1913, 1921, 2 aufl.

Bousset,W., Die Religion des Judentums in Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter,Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903, 1906, 2 aufl.

Bousset,W., Heitmüller,W., Weiss,J., Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, 3 aufl.Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.

Box, G.H., The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the Alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., VI (1905), 80-101.

Box, G.H., St. Matthew, Edinburgh: Jack, 1922.

Bricka, C., Le Fondement Christologique de la Morale Paulienne, Strasbourg; Librairie Istra, 1923.

Briggs,C.A., The Messiah of the Apostles, N.Y.: Scribners,1895.

Briggs,C.A., The Messiah of the Gospels, N.Y.; Scribners, 1894.

Brown, W.A., Parousia, (Art) H.B.D., III, 674-680.

Briggs,C.A., The New Testament Doctrine of the Church, (Art.) A.J.T., IV, 1, (Jan. 1900) 1-22.

Bruce, A.B., St.Paul's Conception of Christianity, Edinburgh: Clark, 1894.

Brückner,M., Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christology, Strassbrug: Heitz, 1903.

Brückner,M., Zum Thema Jesus und Paulus, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., 1906, VII, 112-119.

Büchsel, F., Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926.

Bulcock, H., The Passing and the Permanent in St.Paul, Lond.: Macmillan, 1926.

Bultmann,R., Die Geschichte des Synoptischen Tradition, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.

Bultmann,R., Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., XXIII (1924) 123-140.

Bultmann,R., Der Stil des Paulinischen Predigt und die Kynisch-Stoische Diatribe, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Burkitt,F.C.,Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, Lond.: Constable & Co., 1910, 1922 (2 ed.)

Burton,E.D., Christianity in the Modern World, Chicago: Univ. Press, 1927.

Burton,E.D., The Epistle to the Galatians,N.Y.: Scribners,1920.

Burton,E.D., The Office of Apostle to the Early Church, (Art.) A.J.T., XVI, 4, 560-588.

Burton,E.D., & Willoughby,H.R., A Short Introduction to the Gospels, Chicago: Univ. Press, 1926.

Cadoux,A.T., The Gospel that Jesus Preached, N.Y.:Macmillan,1925.

Cambridge Biblical Essays,(Ed.Swete,H.B.) Lond.: Macmillan,1909.

Campbell,J.M.,Paul the Mystic, Lond.: Melrose; 1907.

Camus, L., L'Oeuvre des Apôtres, 3 vol. Paris: Oudin, 1905.

Carpenter,J.E.,The Bible in the 19th Century, Lond:Longmans,1903.

Carpenter,J.E.,The First Three Gospels, Lond.: S.S. Assoc., 1890, 2 ed.

Carr, A., The Authenticity & Originality of the First Gospel, (Art.) Expositor, IV, 1907, 339-349.

Case, S.J., Kurios as a Title for Christ, (Art.) J.B.L., 1907, XXVI, 151-161.

Case, S.J., Jesus, Chicago: Univ. Press, 1927.

Case, S.J., Paul's Historical Relation to the First Disciples, (Art.) A.J.T., XI, 2, (Apr.1907) 269-286.

Castor,G.D., Matthew's Sayings of Jesus, Chicago: Univ.Press,1918.

Chadwick,W.Ed.,Social Teaching of St.Paul,Cambridge:Univ.Press, 1906.

Charles,R.H., The Book of Enoch, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912, 2 ed.

Charles,R.H., Eschatology, Lond.: Black, 1913.

Charles,R.H., Eschatology, (Art.) Ency.Bib.,II,1335-1390.

Chase, F.H., The Lord's Command to Baptize, (Art.) Jour. of Theol. Studies (July,1905) VI, 24, 481-519.

Clarke,J.F., The Ideas of the Apostle Paul, Bost.: Houghton, Mifflin, 1897.

Colani, T., Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques, Strasbourg:Treuttel et Wurtz,1864, (2 ed.)

Conybeare,W.J.& Howson,J.S., Life and Epistles of St.Paul, N.Y.: Scribners, 1869.

Clemen, A., Der Gebrauch des Altes Testamentes in des neutestamentlichen Schriften, Güterloh: Bertelsmann, 1895.

Clow, W.M., The Church and the Sacraments, Lond.: Clarke,1925.

Cohu, J.R., The Gospel in the Light of Modern Research, Oxford: Parker, 1909.

Cohu, J.R., St. Paul, Lond.: Arnold, 1911.

Conybeare,F.C.,Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels, (Art.) Hibbert Journal (Oct. 1902), I, 1, 96-113.

Conybeare,F.C.,The Eusebian Form of the Text Mt.28:19, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., II (1901) 275-288.

Creed, J.M., The Heavenly Man, (Art.) J.T.S. (Jan.25) XXVI, 102, 113-136.

Crum,J.M.C., The Document Q, (Art.) Hibbert Jour.XXIV, 3, (Apr. 1926) 537-562.

Crum,J.M.C., The Original Jerusalem Gospel, Lond.: Constable & Co., 1927.

Dalman, G.H., Die Worte Jesus, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1898. Tr. Kay, D.M. Edinburgh: Clark, 1902.

Davidson, S., Introduction to the New Testament, 2 vol. Lond.: Kegan Paul, 1894.

Deissmann, A., New Testament Research, (Art.) Review of the Churches, II, 1 (Jan. 1925) 190-200.

Deissmann, A., Paulus, Tübingen, Mohr, 1911 (2 aufl.) 1925, Tr.Strachan, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, undated. Tr. Wilson, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926.

Deissmann, A., Religion of Jesus and Faith of Paul, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.

Denney, J., Law, (Art.) H.B.D., III, 73-83.

Dewick, E.C., Primitive Christian Eschatology, Camb.: Univ. Press, 1912.

Dibelius, M., Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen: Mohr, 1919.

Dittmar, W., Vetus Testamentum in Novo, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1 Band, 1899, 2 Band, 1903.

Dobschütz,E.von,Christian Life in the Primitive Church, Tr. Brenner, G. Lond.: Williams & Norgate,1904.

Dobschütz,E.von,The Eschatology of the Gospels, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

Dodd, C.H., The Meaning of St.Paul for Today, N.Y. Doran: 1920.

Dods, M., Introduction to the New Testament, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890.

Drescher, R., Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus, (essay) Festgruss Bernhard Stade. Giessen: Ricker, 1900.

Drews, A., Die Entstehung des Christentums, Jena: Diederichs, 1924.

DuBose, W.P., The Soteriology of the New Testament, N.Y. Macmillan, 1892.

DuPont, G., Le Fils de L'Homme, Paris, Fischbacher, 1924.

Easton, B.S., The Pauline Theology and Hellenism, (Art.) Amer.Jour.Theol.XXI, 3, (July,1917), 358-382.

Eusebius Pamphilus, Ecclesiastical History (tr. Cruse) Phila.: R. Davis & Bro., 1840.

Falconer,R.A., Lord's Supper, (Art.) D.C.G., II,63-71.

Feine, P., Das Christentum Jesu und das Christentum der Apostol, Stuttgart: Kielmann, 1904.

Feine, P., Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1923.

Feine, P., Jesus Christus und Paulus, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1902.

Feine, P., Die Religion des Neuen Testaments, Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921.

Feine, P., Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1922, 4, aufl.

Findlay, J.A., Jesus in the First Gospel, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, undated.

Findlay, J.A., Jesus as They Saw Him, (Part III) Lond.: Epworth Press, 1920.

Foakes-Jackson,F.J.,& Lake,K., edit., The Beginnings of Christianity, vol.I.,Lond.: Macmillan,1920.

Foakes-Jackson,F.J., The Life of St.Paul, N.Y.: Boni & Liveright, 1926.

Forsyth, P.T., The Church and the Sacraments, Lond.: Longmans, 1917.

Fowler, H.T., History and Literature of the New Testament, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1925.

Fowler, H.T., Paul, Q and the Jerusalem Church,(Art.) J.B.L. XLIII, 9-14 (1924)

Frame, J.E., Thessalonians, N.Y.: Scribners, 1912.

Gall, A.F. von,Basileia tou Theou, Heidelberg: Winter, 1926.

Gardner, Percy,A Historical View of the New Testament, Lond.: Black, 1901.

Gardner,Percy, Religious Experience of St.Paul, N.Y.: Putnam,1911.

Gardner, F., A Study of the First Gospel, (Art.) Jour.Bib. Lit. (1890) 1-16 (Part 1).

Bulstrode, E.A., Jones's Jasper, 1927. S.P.A., 11.32-34.

Yeats, W.B., The Tablet of Jade and the Scarlet Phoenix. New London: Stratford: Vietnam, 1904.

Yeats, W.B., Handwriting in Jade Jade Jade Jade, Leipzig: Dublin & Boston, 1904.

Yeats, W.B., Jade Tablets and Phoenix, Leipzig: Mirror, 1903.

Yeats, W.B., The Tablets, and Other Jade Jade, Leipzig: Dublin & Boston, 1903.

Yeats, W.B., Theologia des Jadeen Jade, Leipzig: Mirror, 1903, 2. Aufl.

Yinsley, W.B., Jade in the First Dynasty, London: Jade & Jade, Jade, 1903.

Yinsley, W.B., Jades as Jade Jade Jade, (Part III) London: Jade & Jade, 1903.

Yoshe-Jackson, T.W., et al., The Beginnings of Jade Jade, vol. I, London: Mandarin, 1904.

Yoshe-Jackson, T.W., The Life of Li Tzu-Ssu, N.Y.: Jade & Lightning, 1904.

Zorzych, W.B., The Jade and the Jade, London: Jade, 1903.

Zuhler, E.T., Biography and Literature of the Jade Jade, N.Y.: Jade & Jade, 1903.

Zomer, W.B., Jade, Jade & Jade Jade Jade, (pt. I) N.Y., 1903.

Frame, W.B., The Jade Jade, N.Y.: Jade & Jade, 1903.

Dali, A.K. von, Die Jade der Jade, Heidelberg: Mirror, 1902.

Jacobsen, Petro, A Jade Jade Jade of the Jade Jade, London: Jade, 1901.

Jacobsen, Petro, Jade Jade Jade of Jade Jade, N.Y.: Jade & Jade, 1901.

Jacobsen, T., A Study of the Jade Jade, (Part I) London: Jade, 1903.

Garvie, A.E., The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, (Art.) The Expos.Times,XXXVIII, II, 484-489. (Aug.1927).

Garvie, A.E., Studies of Paul and His Gospel, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911.

Gayford, S.C.,Church, (Art.) H.D.B., I, 425-439.

Gebhardt, H., Die Zukunft des Menschensohns nach den Synoptikern, (Art.) X.K.W. VI, (1885) 449-461, 505-522.

Gilbert,G.H., The First Interpreters of Jesus, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1901.

Gilbert,G.H., The Interpretation of the Bible, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1908.

Gilbert,G.H., Jesus and His Bible, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1926.

Gloag, P.J., Intro.to the Synoptic Gospels, Edinburgh: Clark, 1895.

Gloatz, P., Zur Vergleichung der Lehre des Paulus mit der Jesu, (Art.) Theol.Stud. u. Krit.(1895) 777-800.

Glover, T.R., Paul of Tarsus, N.Y.: Doran, 1925.

Godet, F., Introduction au N.T., Paris: Fischbacher, 1897.

Goguel, M., Introduction au Nouveau Testament, I, Paris: E.Leroux, 1923.

Goguel, M., Jésus de Nazareth, Paris: Payot, 1925. Tr. Stephens, Lond.: Fisher Unwin, 1926.

Goodspeed,E.J.,(Art.) Journal of Rel. VI: 6. 561-9.(Nov.1926).

Grieve,A.J., Matthew, (Art.) Peake's Commentary on Bible, 700-723. N.Y.: Nelson, 1920.

Guignebert,C. Manuel d'histoire ancienne du Christianisme. Paris: Picard, 1906.

Harnack, A., The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries, Tr.Pogson, F.L. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1910.

Harnack, A., History of Dogma, 7 vol. Tr. Buchanan, N.Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1894-1899.

Harnack, A., Lukas der Arzt, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1906. Tr. Luke the Physician, Wilkinson,J.R., Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1907.

Harnack, A., Mission and Expansion of Christianity, Tr. J.Moffatt, 2 vol. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1908. 2 ed.

Harnack, A., The Origin of the New Testament, Tr. Wilkinson. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1925.

Harnack, A., The Sayings of Jesus, Tr. Wilkinson, J.R. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1908.

Harnack, A., What is Christianity, Tr. Saunders (2 ed.) N.Y.: Putnams, 1906.

Harrison,P.N.,The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, Lond.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1921.

Hamilton,H.F.,The People of God, 2 vol. Lond.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1912.

Hatch,W.H.P.,The Idea of Faith in Christian Literature, Strasbourg: Imprimerie Alsacienne, 1925.

Hatch,W.H.P.,The Pauline Idea of Faith, Cambridge:C.U.Press, 1917.

Haupt, E., Die Eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1895.

Haupt, E., Zum Verständnis des Apostolats im Neuen Testament, Halle: Niemeyer, 1896.

Hawkins,J.C.,Horae Synopticae, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909. 2 ed.

Headlam,A.C.,Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1923.

Headlam,A.C.,St.Paul and Christianity, N.Y.: Longmans,1913.

Heigl, B., Die Vier Evangelien, Freiburg: Herder, 1916.

Heitmüller,W.Taufe und Abendmahl in Urchristentum, Tübingen: Mohr, 1911.

Heitmüller,D.Zum Thema Paulus und Jesus, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., 1912, XIII, 320-337.

Hilgenfeld, A., Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Leipzig: Fues, 1875.

Holdsworth,W.W.,Gospel Origins, N.Y.: Scribners, 1913.

Holsten, C., Die Drei Ursprünglichen, noch ungescriebenen Evangelien, Leipzig: Reuther, 1883.

Holsten, C., Die Synoptischen Evangelien, Heidelberg: Groos, 1886.

Holtzmann,H.J., Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu, Tübingen: Mohr, 1907.

Holtzmann,H.J., Neutestamentlichen Theologie, 2 vol.Tübingen, Mohr, 1911.

Holtzmann, J., Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum, (Art.) Z.N.T. W., (Art.) V, (1904), 89-120.

Holtzmann, O., Leben Jesu, Tübingen: Mohr, 1901. Tr.Bealby & Canney, Lond.: Black, 1904.

Hort,F.J.A., Judaistic Christianity, Lond.: Macmillan,1894.

Hort, F.J.A., The Christian Ecclesia, Lond.: Macmillan,1898.

Huck, A., Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien (6 aufl.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1922.

Jackson, H.L., The Eschatology of Jesus, Lond.:Macmillan,1913.

Jacoby, H., Neutestamentliche Ethik, Königsberg: Thomas & Oppermann, 1899.

Jones, M., The New Testament in the Twentieth Century, Lond.: Macmillan, 1914.

Jones,Maurice, The Four Gospels, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1921.

Jülicher, A., Einleitung in das Neue Testament, (Tr.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1921 (6 ed.) Tr. Ward,J.P., Lond.: Smith, Elder & Co., 1904.

Juncker, A., Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus, Halle: Niemeyer, 1904, 1 Halfte, 1919, 2 Hälfte.

Kabisch, R., Die Eschatologie des Paulus, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893.

Kattenbusch,F.,Die Vorzugstellung des Petrus and der Charakter der Urgemeinde du Jerusalem, (Art.) Festgabe, Karl Muller, Tübingen,Mohr, 1922.

Keil, C.F., Evangelium des Matthaus, Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1877.

Keim, T., Jesu von Nazara, Zurich: Orell, 1867-1872 (3 vol.) Tr. Ransom, H., Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1876-1883, 6 vol.

Kennedy, H.A.A.St.Paul's Conceptions of Last Things, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1904.

Kennedy,H.A.A.,The Theology of the Epistles, Lond.: Duckworth, 1919.

Kidd, B.J., History of the Church to A.D. 461, 3 vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.

Kittel, G., Die Wirkungen des Christlichen Abendmahls nach dem Neuen Testament, (Art.) Theologische Studien und Kritiken,p.214-237.(Aug.1925).

Klausner, J., Jesus of Nazareth, Tr.Danby,H., N.Y.: Macmillan, 1925.

Klosterman,E., (Lietzmann,H.) Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (2 Band). Tübingen: Mohr, 1907 (Mk) 1909, (Mt.) 1919, (Lk).

Knopf, R., Paul and Hellenism, (Art.) Amer.Jour.Theol. XVIII (Oct.1914), 497-520.

Knowling, R.J.,The Witness of the Epistles, Lond.: Longmans,1893.

Knowling, R.J.,The Testimony of St.Paul to Christ, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911.

Kohler, K., New Testament, (Art.) Jew.Ency.IX, 246-254. N.Y.: Funk & Wagnalls, 1905.

Kreyenbuhl, J.,Der Apostel Paulus und die Urgemeinde, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., VIII, 81-109; 163-189.

LaGrange, M.J.,Évangile selon Saint Matthew, Paris: Gabalda,1923.

LaGrange,M.J., L'Origine de la version, Syro-Palestinienne des Évangéles, Revue Biblique, XXXIV, (Oct. 1925) 483-504.

Lake, W., The Earlier Epistles of St.Paul, Lond.: Rivington, 1914, 2 ed.

Lake, K., Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity, Lond.: MacMillan, 1920.

Lambert, J.C., The Sacraments in the New Testament, Edinburgh: Clark, 1903.

Leigh-Bennett, E., Handbook of the Early Christian Fathers, Lond.: Norgate and Williams, 1920.

Leisegang, Hans, Der Apostel Paulus als Denker, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.

Lietzmann, H., Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament, 1 Band, 3 Teil. Wendland P. Tübingen, Mohr, 1912.

Lightfoot, J.B. Galatians, Lond.: Macmillan, 1865.

Lockton, W., The Origin of the Gospels, (Art.) Church Quart. XCIV, 188, 216-239 (July 1922).

Lock, Walter, The Pastoral Epistles, N.Y.: Scribner's, 1924.

Loisy, A., Les Évangiles Synoptiques, Tome I: (Paris) Ceffonds, 1907.

Loisy, A., Les Mystères païens et le Mystère Chrétien, Paris: Nourry, 1914.

Lummis, E.W., The Case Against Q, (Art.) Hib.Jour.XXIV, 4, 755-765, (July 1926).

Lutgert, W., Die Liebe im Neuen Testament, Leipzig: Deichert, 1905.

Machen, J.G., Bib. and Theol. Studies, (art.) Jesus and Paul, 547-578. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1912.

Machen, J.G., Origin of Paul's Religion, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1921.

Marriott, H., The Sermon on the Mount, Lond.: Soc. for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925.

Massebieau, E. Examen des Citations selon Saint Matthieu, Paris: Fischbacher, 1885.

Matheson, Geo. The Historical Christ of St.Paul, (Art.) Expositor Ser. 2, I, 43-62, II 27-47.

Mathews, S., The Messianic Hope in the New Testament, Chicago: Univ.of Chicago Press - 1905.

McGiffert,A.C.,The Apostolic Age, N.Y.; Scribners,1897, (rev.) 1906.

McGiffert,A.C.,Mysticism in the Early Church, (Art.) A.J. T., XI, 3, (July,1907) 407-429.

McNeile, A.H.,Gospel According to St.Matthew, Lond.: Macmillan, 1915.

McNeile, A.H.,Israel, (Art.) D.C.G., I, 839-843.

McNeile,A.H.,New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1923.

Meyer, E., Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, (5 Aufl.) Berlin: Cotta, I, 1921. II,1923. III, 1925.

Micklem,P.A.,St.Matthew, Lond.: Methuen, 1917.

Milligan,Geo.The Servant of the Lord in the Gospel According to St.Matthew, (Art.) Expositor, II, 463-472.

Moffatt, J., The Approach to the New Testament, N.Y.: Doran, 1922.

Moffatt, J., The Historical New Testament,Edinburgh:Clark, 1901.

Moffatt, J., Introduction to the New Testament, N.Y.: Scribners, 1911.

Moffatt, J., Paul and Paulinism, Bost.: Houghton, Mifflin, 1910.

Moffatt, J., Theology of the Gospels, N.Y.: Scribners, 1913.

Monnier, H., La Notion de l'Apostolat, Paris: Leroux, 1903.

Montefiore,C.G.,Judaism and St.Paul, Lond.: Goschen, 1914.

Montefiore,C.J.,The Synoptic Gospels, (2 vol.) Lond.: Macmillan, 1909, 1927.

Moore, G.F., Judaism, (2 vol.) Cambridge:Harv.Univ.Press,1927.

Morgan, W., Judgment, (Art.) D.A.C.,I, 661-664.

Morgan, W., The Religion and Theology of Paul, Edinburgh: Clark, 1917.

Morison, J., Commentary on Matthew, Bost: Bartlett, 1884, (7 ed.) 1890.

Muirhead,L.A.The Eschatology of Jesus, Lond.: Melrose,1904.

Mundle, W., Das religiöse Leben des Apostels Paulus, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.

Nollath,C.F.,Rise of the Christian Religion, Lond.: Macmillan, 1917.

Oepke, A., Die Missionspredigt des Apostels Paulus, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1920.

Paret, H., Paulus und Jesus, (Art.) J.D.T.,III (1858),1-85.

Patton,C.S., Did Jesus Call Himself Son of Man? (Art.) Jour. of Rel. II, 5 (Sept.1922) 501-511.

Patton, Carl S.,Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1915.

Peabody,F.G.,The Apostle Paul and the Modern World, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1923.

Peake,A.S., The Quintessence of Paulinism, N.Y.:Longmans,1918.

Pfleiderer,O.Christian Origins, (tr.) Huebsch,D.A., N.Y.: Huebsch, 1906.

Pfleiderer,O.Influence of Apostle Paul upon Christianity, (tr.) Smith, J., N.Y.: Scribner's: 1885.

Pfleiderer,O.Paulinism, (tr.) Peters; Lond.: Williams and Norgate, 1877.

Pfleiderer,O.Primitive Christianity, (tr.) Montgomery, 4 vol. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1906-1911.

Piepenbring,C., Jésus Historique, (2 ed.) Paris: Librairie Istra, 1922,(tr.)Clare,L.A.,N.Y.:Macmillan,1924.

Pieper,Karl, Die Missionspredigt des ~~li~~ Paulus, ihre fundstellen und ihr inhalt, Paderborn: Schöningh, 1921.

Plummer, A., St.Matthew, Lond.: Scott, 1915.

Porter,F.C., The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul, (Art.) J.B.L. LXI, (1922) 193-204.

Prat, F., La Théologie de St.Paul, Paris:Beauschesne, 1909.

Pratt,E.J., Studies in Pauline Eschatology, Toronto: Briggs, 1917.

Pullan,Leighton, The Gospels, Lond.: Longmans, 1912.

Ramsay,W.M., St.Paul, The Traveller and The Roman Citizen, (3 ed.) N.Y.: Putnam's, 1898.

Rauschenbusch,W., A Theology for the Social Gospel, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1917.

Rawlinson,A.E.J., The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, N.Y.: Longmans, 1927.

Reid, W.D., Jesus the Christ & Paul the Apostle, Lond.: Brown, 1915.

Reitzenstein, R., Die hellinistischen Mysterien - religionen, (2 vol.) Leipzig: Tuebner, 1920 (2 aufl.)

Renan, E., Les Évangiles, Paris: Levy, 1877.

Renan, E., Vie de Jésus, Paris: Nelson, 1863. (tr.) Lockwood. N.Y.: Carlton, 1869.

Resch, A., Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904.

Resch, A., Die Verwandtschaft Zwischen den Paulinischen Schriften und die synoptischen Evangelien, Z.K.W. IX, 1888, 279-295.

Reuss, E., Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne, (2 vol.) (3 ed.) Strasbourg et Paris, Treuttel et Wurtz, 1864. History of Christian Theology in Apostolic Age, (tr.) Harwood, A. (2 vol.) Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1874.

Reville, A., L'Évangile selon St.Matthieu, Leide:VanGoor,1862.

Riggenbach,Ed. Der trinitarische Taufbefehl Mt. 28:19, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1903.

Robertson,A.T.,St.Matthew, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1911.

Porter, F. E. The Place of Aesthetical Conceptions in the Theory of Ethics. (Ser.) . . . . 1917.

Pous, J. La Tendresse de Dieu. Paris: Desclée, 1960.

Prall, D. W. Studies in Religious Synthesis. Toronto: Ryerson, 1919.

Pulleyn, Ralphton. The Gospels. Lond.: Longmans, 1912.

Murray, G. W. (ed.). The Travellers and The Green Pilgrim. (2 vol.) . . . : Swains'e, 1900.

Rauschenbusch, T. A Theology for the Social Gospel. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1917.

Reallexicon, A. G. . . Die Der Jahrhunderte Dichtung of the Christ. 2 . . . : Langmans, 1907.

Reid, T. G. Jesus the Christ & Jesus the Apostle. Lond.: Green, 1911.

Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterien - Religionen. (2 vol.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1910 (2 edit.)

Renan, E. Les Apostles. Paris: Levy, 1877.

Renan, E. Vie de Jesus. Paris: Calmann, 1863. (17. Jahr-gang. 2 . . . : Cerfbon, 1867.

Rehm, A. Der Christlichen und die Jesus Kult. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1904.

Revel, A. Des Phénomènes Extatiques des Religions Celtes et des Religions Germaniques. . . . . 1898.

Reuss, E. Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne. (2 vol.) (2 ed.) Strasbourg et Paris, Treuttel et Wurtz, 1864. History of Christian Theology in Apostolic Age. (tr.) Darwood, A. (2 vol.) Lond.: Rodger & Thompson, 1872.

Reville, A. L'Evangile selon St. Matthieu. Leipz: Tauchnitz, 1862.

Rigaux, M. Dieu Ressuscite Tout'Ecrits du Nouveau. Gembloux: Duculot, 1956.

Robertson, A. T. St. Matthew. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1923.

Robinson,J.A., Baptism, (Art.) Ency.Bib., I, 471-477.

Robinson,J.A., The Study of the Gospels, Lond.:Longmans,1906.

Roehrich, E., La Composition des Évangiles,Paris:Fischbacher, 1897.

Roos, F., Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu, Ludwigsburg: Neubert, 1887.

Ropes, J.H., The Apostolic Age, N.Y.: Scribner's, 1912.

Ross, D.M., The Spiritual Genius of St.Paul, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1925.

Rostron,S.N., The Christology of St.Paul, Lond.:Scott, 1912.

Sabatier, A., The Apostle Paul, (tr.) Heller. N.Y.:Pott,1891.

Salmon, G., Introduction to the New Testament, Murray: London, 1897.

Sanday, W., The Apocalyptic Elements in the Gospels, (Art.) Hib. Jour. X, 83-109 (1911).

Sanday, W., Inspiration, Lond.: Longmans, 1893.

Sanday, W., The Life of Christ in Recent Research, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1907.

Sanday, W. and Headlam,A.C., Romans, Edinburgh: Clark, 1895.

Sanday, W., St.Paul's Equivalent for the Kingdom of Heaven, (Art.) J.T.S., I, 4, (July 1900) 481-491.

Schanz, P., Evangelism des Heiligen Matthaus, Freiburg: Herder, 1879.

Schweitzer, A.,The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, (tr.) Lowrie, W.: London.: Black, 1925.

Schlatter,D.A.,Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit, Gütersloh;Bertelsmann, 1926.

Schmiedel,P.W.,Gospels, (Art.) Ency. Bib. II, 1761-1898, Lond.: Black, 1901.

Schmitz, O., Die Christus-gemeinschaft des Paulus, Gütersloh; Bertelsmann, 1924.

Schmitz, O., Die Lebensgefühl des Paulus, München:Beck,1922.

Schmoller, O., Die geschichtliche Person Jesu nach den Paulinischen Schriften, (Art.) T.S.K. LXVII, 4, 654-705.

Schniewand,J., Die Begriffe Wort und Evangelism bei Paulus, Bonn.: Georgi, 1910.

Schweitzer,A., Von Reimarus zu Wrede, Tubingen: Mohr, 1906. The Quest of the Historical Jesus (tr.Montgomery) Lond.: Black, 1911, (2 ed.)

Scott, C.A., Christianity According to St.Paul, Cambridge: Camb. Univ. Press, 1927.

Scott, C.A.A., The Fellowship of the Spirit, Lond.:Clarke,1921.

Scott, C.A., The Gospel According to St.Paul, (Art.) Expositor, II, (1900) 202-210.

Scott, C.A.A., (Art.) Jesus and Paul in Camb.Bib.Essays, Lond.: Macmillan, 1909.

Scott, E.F., The First Age of Christianity, N.Y.:Macmillan, 1926.

Scott, E.F., The Kingdom and the Messiah, Edinburgh:Clarke, 1911.

Scott, E.F., The Spirit in the New Testament, Lond.: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Scott, R., The Pauline Epistles, Edinburgh: Clarke, 1909.

Seeberg, A., Die Taufe im Neuen Testament, Biblische Zeit und Streitfragen, Berlin: Runge, 1905.

Seeberg, R., Der Ursprung des Christusglaubens, Leipzig: Deichert, 1914.

Sharman, H.B., The Teaching of Jesus about the Future, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1909.

Shaw, R.D., The Pauline Epistles, Edinburgh: Clarke, 1903.

Simpson, J.G., The Sacraments of the Gospel, Lond.: Longmans, 1914.

Smith, D., Life and Letters of St.Paul, N.Y.: Doran,undated.

Sneath,E.H. (editor), Religion and the Future Life, N.Y.: Revell, 1922.

Soltau, W., Unsere Evangelien, Leipzig: Dieterich, 1901.

Somerville,D.,St.Paul's Conception of Christ, Edinburgh: Clarke, 1897.

Stanton,V.H., The Gospels as Historical Documents, Lond.: Camb.Univ.Press. Part I, 1903; Part II, 1909; Part III, 1920.

Stanton,V.H., The Jewish and the Christian Messiah, Edinburgh: Clark, 1886.

Stead, J.H., Does the original collection of Logia contain predictions of our Lord's resurrection? (Art.) The Expositor,Ser.8, No.131 (Nov.1921) 397-400.

Stephenson,T.,The O.T. Quotations Peculiar to Matthew, (Art.) J.T.S. XX, 79 (Apr. 1919) 227-229.

Stevens, G.B.,Is there a self consistent New Testament Eschatology? (Art.) A.J.T. VI, 4 (Oct.1902) 666-684.

Stevens, G.B.,The Pauline Theology, N.Y.: Scribners, 1893.

Strack, H. & Billerbeck, P., Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrash, München: Beck, 1922.

Streeter,B.H.,The Four Gospels, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1925.

Strauss,D.F., A New Life of Jesus, 2 vol. (2 ed. Tr. not named) Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1879.

Studies in the Synoptic Problem, by Members of Univ.of Oxford. Oxford: Oxf.Univ.Press, 1911.

Sturm, W., Paulus und die evangelische Überlieferung, Berlin: Gaertner: 1897.

Swete, H.B., Intro.to the Old Testament in Greek, Camb.: Univ.Press, 1900.

Swete, H.B., Studies in the Teaching of our Lord, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1904. 2 ed.

Thackeray,H.J.The Relation of St.Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, Lond.: Macmillan, 1900.

Thayer, J.H., Recent Discussions Respecting the Lord's Supper, (Art.) J.B.L. XVIII, 110-131 (1897).

Tillman, F., Der Menschensohn, Freiburg: Herder, 1907.

Titius, A., Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligheit, Tübingen: Mohr, 1900.

Toy, C.H., Quotations in the New Testament, N.Y.: Scribners, 1884.

Turpie, C.D., The New Testament View of the Old, Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1872.

Vedder, H.C., The Fundamentals of Christianity, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1922.

Volkmar, G., Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien, Zurich: Schmidt, 1876.

Vollmer, H., Die Alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus, Freiburg: Mohr, 1895.

Völter, D., Jesus der Menschensohn, Strassburg: Heitz,1914.

Volz, P., Jüdische Eschatologie, Tübingen: Mohr, 1903.

Von Soden, H.,(Art.) Das Interesse des Apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte, in Theologische Abhandlungen (Weizsäcker, gewidmet). Freiburg: Mohr, 1892.

Von Soden, H.,The History of the Early Christian Literature, Tr. J.R.Wilkinson, Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1906.

Wade, G.W., New Testament History, N.Y.: Dutton; undated.

Wagenmann, J.,Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf, Giessen: Topelmann, 1926.

Warshauer,J., The Historical Life of Christ, Lond.: Fisher Unwin, 1927.

Weber, W., Christusmystik, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1924.

Weinel, H., Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen: Mohr, 1911.

Weinel, H., St.Paul, The Man and His Work, (Tr.) Bieneman, G.A., N.Y.: Putnams, 1906.

Weiss, B., Life of Christ, 2 vol. (Tr.) Hope,J.W., Edinburgh: Clark, 1883.

Weiss, B., A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, (Tr.) Davidson, A.J.K. 2 vol. Lond.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1887.

Weiss, J., Die Bedeutung des Paulus für den modernen Christen, (Art.) Z.N.T.W., XXI (1920) 127-142.

Weiss, J., Die Composition der Synoptischen Wiederkunftsrede, (Art.) Theol.Stud. & Krit., 1892, 246-270.

Weiss, J., Ethics, (Art.) D.C.G., I, 543-547.

Weiss, J., Jesus im Glauben des Urchristentums, Tübingen: Mohr, 1910.

Weiss, J., Paul and Jesus, (Tr.) Chaytor,H.J., N.Y.: Harpers, 1909.

Weiss, J., Das Urchristentum, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1. Teil, 1914; 2. Teil, 1917, R.Knopf.

Wellhausen,J., Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, Berlin: Reimer, 1911, 2 ed.

Wendt, H.H.,Die Lehre Jesus, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, I, 1886, II,1890, 2 Aufl. 1901. (Tr.) Wilson,J., 2 vol. N.Y.: Scribners, 1892.

Wernle, P., Die Aufänge unserer Religion, Tübingen: Mohr, 1901, 1904 2 aufl. (Tr.) Bienemann,G.A., The Beginnings of Christianity, 2 vol. Lond.: Williams & Norgate, 1903.

Wernle, P., Die Reichsgotteshoffung, Tübingen: Mohr, 1903.

Werner, M., Der Einfluss Paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1923.

Westcott,B.F. & Hort,F.J.A., The New Testament in Greek, Lond.: Cambridge, 1881.

Wetter,G.P.,Der Sohn Gottes, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916.

Windisch, H.Taufe und Sünde, Tübingen: Mohr, 1908.

White, D., Sacraments and the Synoptic Gospels, (Art.) The Modern Churchman, XVI, 6,7,8, (Oct. 1926) 326-335.

Wood,H.G., Some Characteristics of the Synoptic Writers, (Essay V, The Parting of the Roads) Ed. Foakes-Jackson, F.J., Lond.: Arnold, 1912.

Wrede, W., Paulus, Tübingen: Mohr, 1907. (tr.) Lummis, Lond.: Green, 1907.

Zahn, T., Einleitung in das Neue Testament, (3 aufl.) Leipzig: Deichert, 1906. Tr. direction Jacobus. 3 vol. N.Y.: Scribners, 1909.

Zahn, J., Das Evangelium des Matthäus, Leipzig: Deichert,1903.

Zeigler,T.,Geschichte der Christlichen Ethik, Strassburg: Trübner, 1892.

Autobiography

Date and place of birth:

July 2, 1893; Adrian, Michigan.

Names of Parents:

J. Marion Beck.
Hallie Clement Beck.

Schools and Colleges Attended:

Jamestown (New York) High School, 1908-1912.
Syracuse University, 1914-1918, A.B.
Phi Beta Kappa
Phi Kappa Phi
Varsity Baseball
White Memorial Senior Oratorical Contest
Boston University School of Theology, 1919-1922, S.T.B.
Boston University Graduate School, 1922-1924.
Theological School in Harvard University, 1922-1924.

Positions Held:

Teacher in public schools, Mt. Morris, New York, 1912-1914.
Minister - Rockefeller Memorial M.E. Church, Syracuse, 1916-1919.
Professor of History, Cazenovia Seminary, 1918-1919.
Minister - Nahant (Mass.) Congregational Church, 1919-1924.
Professor of English Bible - Mount Union College, 1924-1928.
Instructor, Boston University Summer Session, 1925.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02487 0620

NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY